

VETERES VINDICATI,
IN AN
Expostulatory Letter
TO
Mr. SCLATER of PUTNEY
UPON HIS
CONSENSUS VETERUM, &c.

WHEREIN

The Absurdity of his Method
The Weakness of his Reasons } are shewn,

His false Aspersions upon the Church of England are wiped off;
and her FAITH concerning the EUCHARIST proved to be
THAT of the PRIMITIVE CHURCH.

Together with Animadversions on Dean Boileau's French Transla-
tion of, and Remarks upon Bertram.
Edward Gee, A. M.

King Charles the Martyr to the Prince. Eux. Bana, 27.

But if you never see my face again — I do Require and intreat you as your FATHER, and your KING, that you never suffer your heart to receive the least check against, or Disaffection from the TRUE RELIGION established in the CHURCH of ENGLAND. I tell you I have TRYED IT, and after MUCH SEARCH and MANY DISPUTES have concluded IT to be BEST in the WORLD, not only in the Community, as Christian, but also in the special nation, as Reformed; keeping the middle way between the POMP of SUPERSTITIOUS TYRANNY, and the MEANNESS of FANTASTICK ANARCHY.

LONDON, Printed for Henry Morstock, at the Phoenix in
St. Paul's Church-yard, and at the White Hart in
Westminster Hall. 1687.

IMPRIMATUR,

Guil. Needham RR. in Christo
P. ac D. D. *Wilbelmo* Ar-
chiep. *Cantuar.* à Sacr. Do-
mest.

Ex *Ædib. Lambeth.*
Apr. 7. 1687.

TO THE
READER.

I*t is not material to thee to know what were the particular Reasons that put me upon answering this Book of Mr. Sclater: whether it were a Challenge, or a Request, both, or neither; such as it is, it was designed for a Vindication of our most Holy Mother the Church of England from those very silly, and very false Aspersions cast upon her by Mr. Sclater up and down his Book. I hope no one will think that I have been too sharp upon him, I am certain his behaviour in his Book was so very extravagant, and his abuses so open, and so intolerable, that I can assure the Reader that it was with trouble that I did restrain using oftner a just Indignation. There is no one that reads him, who, had he been to examine his Quotations as I obliged my self for the most of them, would not, I think, have been as sharp upon him as I have any where been. It would have stirred up a very meek man's Indignation to have been served as he did me his Reader with his Quotation from Hilary, pag. 38. where having by chance cast my eye on the first part of the passage set down by him, I went hunting for the rest of it as it stood in his Book, quite through St. Hilary's whole Book from thence, and little dreamed of what I was very angry to find that I was to look backwards in St. Hilary for the other two parts of that passage. There*

To the Reader.

are other dealings in his Book much more provoking than this. However, if any one think I am too severe upon him, I must only say, that it is perchance more pardonable in me than in another: not that I have any personal quarrel against Mr. Sclater, whom I am morally certain I never spoke with in my life; but upon another account.

One short Address I cannot avoid the making here to my Brethren of the Clergy, who have not opportunities of a full examination of these Controversies in Antiquity itself, that they would beware for Mr. Sclater's sake of taking things too much on trust from our Romish Adversaries, or of relying too much on some extraordinary passages out of the Fathers. This Address I make, because I have been informed that this unhappy man was very much imposed upon, and perhaps almost perverted by that passage out of St. Chrysostome about St. Peter's having the Care of the whole Church committed to him: which passage therefore I was the more careful to examine, and to confute it, that some may see how unsafe it is to rely on scraps of Fathers about these Things, and how little they ought to value even the most favourable place out of Antiquity for Popery, since the stress of all Antiquity is directly against it, as our excellent Writers have abundantly shewn, and even such as I am able to shew.

A N
EXPOSTULATORY
L E T T E R
T O
Mr. EDWARD SCLATER
of PUTNEY.

S I R,

THE expectation that some person of more leisure, and better abilities would have condescended to the trouble of examining this your Treatise, was the sole reason that hindred your receiving *this* sooner from me: I am very certain there is nothing in *it*, either so strong, or so well managed, that could affright any such from bringing *your Book* to account, and therefore I must impute their neglect herein to another cause, which I believe you are not at all desirous to hear mentioned by me. I am sure I have the opinion of some and those learned persons to confirm me in this my belief.

'Tis for *your own sake* therefore chiefly, and for those Readers who may possibly be startled at the Title of your Book, that I undertake to examine *it*, and to oblige *you* and *them* to see, how very little reason you had (or they to be mov'd by it) to call your *Book Consensus Veterum*, and what a miserable mistake you have made in this your *forsaking the Communion of your Mother the Church of England*, and *falling to that of Rome*.

I hope you will not be angry that I take the same liberty to examine your method in this Change, that you say *you* did to

B

examine

examine that of *our Church*. One thing I'll promise you (which I am persuaded I shall in the examining of *your reasons* find you very often faulty in) that I will constantly, as to my Proofs and Authorities, use all the fairness and ingenuity that becomes a Scholar, or a Christian herein. The *Cause* of the *Church of England* is so infinitely better, and more steady, than *that* you have so lately espoused, that it would be as extremely imprudent, as unjust to practise the contrary in the defence of *her*; as *she* does not need, so I am sure *she* does abhor, and is far from admitting any indirect, or fraudulent management of *her Cause*.

I shall therefore without any farther Preface, prosecute my design, and begin with *your Preface*, which presents the *Reader* with a needless *Apology* about the *Plural Title* of *your Treatise*; for if those other quotations and proofs about the *true Catholick Church*, and the *Supremacy* of *St. Peter* and the *Bishops* of *Rome* were of any force with you, they deserve their place in the *Plural Title* of *your Book*, if they were not, yet *that other* about the *Eucharist*, though with you *All in All*, can be but *one*, how great soever.

How *Transubstantiation* concludes *Communion* under *one Species*, I cannot understand, since if *Transubstantiation* was always the Opinion of the *Catholick Church*, as you affirm it was, from the very beginning, it would have concluded *then*, as well as *now*, which I am sure it did not; for, besides our Saviour's Institution in both kinds, and his Precept as strict for either of them singly, as for both together, his most severe imposition of both, *Joh. 6. 53.* we can shew you herein the Obedience of the *Catholick Church* for above a thousand years, who were so humble, and so respectfull also, as not to think themselves either *wiser* than our Saviour, or *above* his express commands herein. Afterwards indeed *one part* of the *Catholick Church* grew more knowing, and the *Council of Constance* (maugre our Saviour's express command to be seen in the *Gospels*, and very particularly in *1 Cor. 11. 24, 25.* *St. Paul*) denied *one half* of the *Communion*, the *Cup*, to the *Laiety*, and so *that Church* continues ever since to do. Among those several Arguments or Reasons mustered up by *Gerson* at the *Command*, and for the *Defence* of this bold *Council*, I do not remember *one*, that is not either ridiculous in it self, or highly reflecting upon *our blessed and most wise Saviour's* prudence or foresight.

But

But to pass by *this*, and your Argument from the 6th of *S. John*, which I shall remember when I come to that point in your *Book*; methinks your assuring your self, that if your former Faith was not right in this (the Eucharist), it was wrong in all controverted Particulars, &c. is none of the clearest Inductions, and would have appeared something too bold, had you not helped it out a little with what I suppose you have heard some of your new Church say, that that Church hath the same Authorities and Traditions for them, as for this, &c. which I think to be one of the greatest truths in your Book, and I do assure you that I am perfectly of the same opinion, that the Church of Rome hath the same neither better nor worse Authorities and Traditions for all the Points controverted betwixt the Church of England and her, that she hath for Transubstantiation, which I question not to shew, when I come to that point, to be either very bad, or none at all.

Whether you have wrought in this your search according to the directions of the Church of England, will be better seen, when we come to your Proofs themselves; I cannot pass the Canon of our Church you have quoted here without making two short Remarks from it.

The first of which is, How little our Church is a favourer or encourager of the Private Spirit you talk so often about, or of private Interpretations, when she doth not allow the Guides of the Parochial Churches themselves to teach any thing for Faith in their Sermons, which is not agreeable to the Doctrine of the Old and New Testament, and the Interpretations of Catholick Antiquity.

pulo religiose teneri & credi velint, nisi quod consentaneum sit Doctrinæ veteris aut Novi Testamenti, quodque ex illâ ipsâ Doctrinâ Catholici Patres, & Veteres Episcopi collegerint, &c. Liber Canon. Disciplina Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ, 1571. Titulo Concionatorcs.

2. That it is a most false as well as a most ridiculous Assertion of your new Brethren of the Church of Rome, who say, our Church slights and rejects the Fathers, because they are all against her, and that she owns they are all against her: for a clear Contradiction to which, I would but desire of any Romanist to reade this short Canon of a Synod of ours in the beginning of Queen Elizabeth seriously over, and to consider it, and I do not question if he would but speak plainly herein, as every ingenuous man ought, that he would own such Assertours to be guilty of a downright Calumny.

For your *Conditional Thanks* that you seem willing to bestow on the Church of England for her *Directions*; she can have no reason to expect any from you, since I am pretty well assured that you have not observed her *Directions*, and therefore can owe her none on that account: and for your *Conditional Prayers* for the Teachers of her Communion, &c. I can assure you, that they are by her *Injunctions*, and without any conditions, not behind-hand with you in such civilities, since thrice a week at least they are commanded in the *Litany* to put up constantly a *Petition* for you, and such as you.

Galatinus and his *Rabbins* I shall refer to their place in your *Book*, to which I shall now pass, finding nothing farther in your *Preface*, that may not be better considered in the *Answers* to the *Particulars* of your *Book*.

CHAP. I.

The Method of the Answer, and a Consideration of Mr. Sclater's Reasons of doubting in our Communion.

BEFORE I undertake the *Particulars* of your *Book*, I cannot refrain the making a complaint to you, that you have not put your writing into a *Method* becoming a Scholar, but have managed your *reasons* so confusedly, and passed so abruptly from one head to another, that it is sometimes difficult to know which of your *points* you are then about. Method and clearness, and a fair transition from one part of a Discourse to another were never counted trifles, nor ever thought unworthy the care of any one Writer that did desire either to *instruct* or to *convince* his Readers.

That I may avoid therefore my self, what I am forc'd to reprehend in another, I shall in this my *Expostulation* confine my self to, and direct my self by, these Rules.

1. To consider the *Reasons* of your doubting during your continuance in our Communion whether you were in the right way, and of a true Church.
2. The *Method* you used for the resolving your self in your doubts.
3. The *Reason* or *Reasons* that convinced you so.

so far as to leave our Communion, and to espouse that of the Church of Rome.

I do not believe I can wrong your Book in taking such a Method, or disoblige you or any one else that may read this.

As to the first head then, the Reasons of your doubting, one might with reason have expected, that you would a little more have enlarged your self in a thing, the right managing of which was of so infinite concern, or at the least that you would have afforded the World tho' but one Reason, that might have given satisfaction. That, which you have put down, I mean the Text from S. Paul, Let him that thinketh he standeth, take heed lest he fall, I am sure, cannot, since that Text may as well serve against the approaching Easter as it did against the last, and you may as well use it now as you did then; and should a giddy mind possess you, and hurry you next to Socinianism, then to the Anabaptists, and herd you at last among the Quakers, no body could refuse you your Motto, and Let him that thinketh he standeth, &c. would serve you in as much stead for any of them, as it did now. Without any satisfaction at all therefore about the reasons of your doubt, which I wish we had had faithfully set down, that so the World might not take that leave it does now of judging what it pleases concerning the true reasons of your leaving us, I must follow you to that wherein you are more copious, the Method you used for the resolving your self in your doubts, which you forgot to set down here.

CHAP. II.

His Account of Education and Interest examined and Refuted.

BEfore you enter on your Method you tell us you had two very great things to conflict with, which were like to prove great obstacles in this your inquiry after truth, Education and Interest, Through Education and Confidence in the Teachers you had been inured to, you complain you had almost been hardened against the listening to any thing contrary to those Precepts and Doctrines they had rooted in you, &c. pag. 1.

To

To hear an old Man complain of *Education* cannot but be a little strange, especially from one who hath been a *Teacher* himself (as he disdainfully I must believe, calls our *Clergy*) perchance betwixt Thirty and Forty Years; if Twenty, nay Ten, far too much sure for such a complaint: and in a *Church* too, which permits and encourages her *Clergy* in the perusing, canvassing and examining all *Books* of Controversie betwixt herself and the *Church* of *Rome*, and which is more, obliges them to a perusal and diligent examination of the *Primitive Fathers* by that very Canon you your self quoted in your Preface, which I have put down also. (1.) But this is the common voice of the *Converts* young or old, and therefore whether to purpose or no, you must for company use it, tho' it be really ridiculous from one in your circumstances, as I think I have made plain enough. And truly the complaint would far the handsomer become you, now when you are of a *Church*, that teaches her *Members* the pretty knack of captivating their understanding, stopping their ears, and shutting their eyes against any thing that might convince them of the Error they are in. I must confess that your *Church* is not singular herein, the *Turks* practise it as strictly as you, that they may secure their *Members* in their excellent and most safe (as they doubtless think it) *Communion* and *Religion* of *Mahomet*.

But suppose *Education* might be a Prejudice, and would give a man a great deal of trouble to rid himself of the *Prepossessions* it commonly instills into green heads, yours could not give you any, since *Alexander* like you cut the Knot that might have given you great trouble to unloose, by abstracting your self (when you entered on your Method) from your self and *Religion* too; which doubtless is both a quick and a sure way of ridding a mans self of the *Prejudices* from any *Religion*, by abstracting himself from *Religion*, and looking on himself as a *Man* of no *Religion*. I cannot but applaud your Method of getting shut of the *Prejudices* of *Education*, and cannot but admire it as the most clever, sure, short, unerring way that any man could take to get rid of *Education*, which I will now with you take leave of, and pass on to *Interest*, and see how you served it.

And here again you are as concise with *Interest*, as you were before with *Education*, if a man may credit you. When I considered (say you) *Solomon's Advice*, buy the Truth, and sell it

it not: *I was easily persuaded to look upon Interest, as a thing worth nothing, &c.* And did you serve it so? why then truly to give you your due, you are an extraordinary Person among the Converts; one to whom an Eye to worldly Interest cannot fairly be objected: and I suppose you are very willing and desirous too, that the World should have such an Opinion of you; that you have fairly quitted all purely for Conscience sake; that you had two Livings indeed; but since you are convinced that you ought not to be any longer a Communicant with, much less a Minister of, the Church of England, you have sacrificed them both to the Interest of your Immortal Soul; that tho' as the World now goes, it is the sure and only way to Preferments in Church or State to continue a Member (at least outwardly) of the Church of England so called, yet you for your part have, and do count all this worldly Interest, as a thing worth nothing, and are resolved to turn your back to it, so that you may but provide for the Salvation of your Soul.

This truly is the Picture of a very excellent Christian, the only question to be asked now is, whether it is Mr. Selater's of Putney; I am sorry that I must acquaint the World, notwithstanding your speaking so contemptibly of Interest, that really it is no more yours than the man's in the Moon; for to be more serious with you, with what face could you write this, when almost all the Kingdom knows, that you hold both your Livings still, tho' you disown your being so much as a Member of the Church of England; and how briskly you bellored and quarrelled the Church of Worcester, when they only desired to fill the Cure of Putney with a Minister of the Church of England, which you denied any longer to own your self to be?

A great many I am sure, think you did very ill to hold those Livings in your present Condition, and I do assure you, it is infinitely worse to do it, and yet by writing to insinuate to the World, that you have not, but have accounted all worldly Interest (the Profits of two Livings may be so named I hope) as a thing worth nothing. You have not lost, or delivered up any worldly concern that I can hear of on this account, you stand I believe in as much probability as ever you did of getting more: if this be the way of slighting, and undervaluing Interest, I do assure you that all the Covetous, the Extortioners, and the worldly Hypocrites do it as much as you.

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

His Method shewn to be Unreasonable.

L Eaving then this *false* as well as *disingenuous* account of your setting aside, and ridding your self of *Interest*, I must begin the Examination of your *Method* of resolving your self in your Doubts, which indeed is surprizing from a *Minister*, and became *Des Cartes* as to matters of *Philosophy*, a little better, than it can do you or any one else in *Matters* of Religion. Here (say you) as I had abstracted my self from my self and Religion too, as a man of no Religion, but contemplating all: I must lay all before me, and look studiously upon them, &c.

pag. 2.

If you mean by this account of your *Method*, that you really put your self into an abstracted state, and were really as of no Religion so of no Church at all during this your search for a *Communion* wherein you might be afterwards safe, I must tell you, that as your *Method* was most extravagant, so it was of too short a duration for your looking studiously, contemplating and comparing the two *Communions* of *England* and *Rome* together, since it is as certain that you were at *Mais* last *Easter Day*, 1686, as that you did give the *Communion* at *Putney Church* on *Palm Sunday* before it, and therefore must have been a *Minister* of the *Church* of *England* on the one Sunday, and a *Member* of the *Church* of *Rome* on the next, during the time betwixt which two Sundays I am certain you are far from being able to have considered and examined the *Merits* of the two *Churches*: you are not so quick a Man, for all your pretended discovering at first sight that all other *Communions* were evidently confusion.

pag. 2.

But allowing that during this search you onely *Ex hypothesi* put your self in such a state without leaving actually our *Communion* till your *Method* and *Reasons* were over and satisfactory, it was a very odd *Method* for a Man that had been so long a *Minister*, and was so old a Man, and would much handsomer have become you, were you coming over from *Paganism*, or *Mahometism*, than from one Church that evidently hath the *Catholic*

Faith

Faith to another. Whichsoever of the two Senses was that which you designed, I am certain that the first was fit onely for a Madman, and the other almost as much unbecoming an old Clergy Man, who after Threescore (as I believe you are) falls to abstracting and doubting, and supposing, as if he had been in a Dream all the rest (and best part) of his Days, since he was in Orders: and at last when others begin to *doie*, he begins to *doubt*, to *search*, and to make *saving discoveries*.

CHAP. IV.

The Confusion of his Search, and the Absurdity of it shown.

NOTWITHSTANDING the Inconsistencies in this your tale, which are so many as would almost ruine any ones having the least value for your Book, or for the Reasons and Arguments in it, I must follow, and see how dexterously you managed, or how well you used this your wonderous Method. Upon a reserved *pag. 2, 3.* Principle (say you) that Christ hath a Church upon earth; in my inquiry amongst my Brethren of the Church of England (who were as much your Brethren in this state, and no more than they are Hobbes's or Spinoza's;) I gave most attention to those teachers or writers, that had most reverence for Church Authority, &c. I appeal to any Man of sense whether this passage does not favour much more of a Man already a Papist, than of a mere Seeker; but to pass that, Pray, Sir, what did you want, or what was you inquiring for? was it for the Catholick Church, or for a particular Communion, wherein you might be safe? if for the Catholick Church, you needed not to be curious whom you inquired of among our Teachers and Writers, since the meanest of them could readily have told you, that the Catholick Church is made up of all the Particular Churches planted in the four quarters of the World, holding from Christ the only Head of her the true Faith, and Catholick Unity; so that if you intended to find where she was fixed, that so you might in necessity tell her your grievances, she is confined to no place, being *pag. 5.* a Diffusive Body throughout the World.

If you wanted a *Particular Communion*, a true *Member* of the *Catholick Church* wherewith to communicate, and upon which to trust your Salvation, the *Church of England* (*Particular* as to place, *Catholick* as to Faith and Doctrine) is such; so that your inquiry might here have ended, since if you were a true *Member* of *Hers*, you were at the same time as true a *Member* of the *Catholick Church*.

Here I must take occasion to tell you, that you seem by your *Abstracting your self from your self*, to have wilder'd your self, and thence to have confounded the Notions of the *Catholick* and *Particular Churches*, while from our Saviour's promise that the *Gates of Hell should never prevail against the Catholick Church*, you argue the *Church* must be one, which no Body denies; that it must have one Faith, which no Body denies neither, and that it must by virtue of *Christ's promise* perpetually abide in this one Faith, nor is this denied any more than the other two by any of our *Church*; and what have you got hence? onely that *Christ* hath and will always have a true *Church* upon Earth, which I know no Body ever denied. But here is the grand pinch, and what one may easily see you aim at, and that is to have this *Catholick Church*, and the *Church of Rome* to be all one and the same; which we shall see how you prove by and by.

In the mean time I must return to you, where I left you quarrelling with our Church-men, and see whether I can make an end of the Quarrel. You say that you found that those of our *Church* that had most Reverence for *Church Authority*, meant onely their own, &c. You had done the World a great kindness, if you had told who they were you inquired of, and what were the *Queries* you put to them. I hope if you asked after the *Catholick Church*, they did not tell you that the *National Church of England* was the whole *Catholick Church*. If you asked after a *Particular Church*, surely you cannot blame them for asserting the *Authority* of their own *Church*. When you put the same *Queries* to the *Romish Teachers* or *Writers*, did they reject their own *Church's Authority*, did not they mean their own, when they would persuade you to their *Communion*, as much as our Men did that of our *Church*, when you inquired among them? where then is the fault? what would you have had 'em to doe to please you? would you have had them to say that the

Chrur

Church of England is the Catholick Church, which no one that hath any sense can say of Her any more than of the Church of Rome? would you have had ^{em} to say that they had a Church indeed, but that either she had no Authority, or that no Body need to submit to it? which none but a mere Ignoramus could say.

This, Sir, is perfect Trifling, this is to write a Book, and yet not to know what one wants, or what he would have. I wish to God you had reserved (when you were abstracting your self) a little Logick, that a Man might have known what you meant here, and where one might have you; that so, when a Reader thinks by your Words and by Connexion that you are talking of the Catholick Church, you may not come off with a Pish, the Man understands me not, I was speaking of Particular Churches. I wish you had licked this your confused piece into a little better Method; and had bestowed on it a little thing called Intelligibility; but perhaps you thought such a stile fittest for a Man that was going to write about Transubstantiation.

You are as little pleased with them, when you say they held the Scriptures in high esteem (you might without a falsity have added, in far greater than the Church of Rome does, of which you now are) though under that Notion, they understood no more, pag. 3. than what themselves were pleased to allow to be Canonical, admitting also some Traditions, but taking and refusing as they saw good, &c.

To be brief with you on this point, if you speak here of particular Persons in our Church, it is utterly false, since they are all obliged to believe that to be the Canon of Scripture, which is set down in the Articles of our Church, and there is not one Man of our Church that is at liberty to believe which he pleases, and to reject which he pleases from being Canonical Scripture to him, and for Traditions received in the Church, no particular Man hath any more power over them, than over the number of the Canonical Books. But if you speak of our Church it self here, (which your words without stretching will not bear,) it is as false of Her, since she believes and delivers those Books onely as Canonical, which the Primitive Church believed and delivered down to her as such: She rejects none as Apocryphal, which were not also rejected as such by the Primitive Church, as the Famous and most Learned Bishop Cosin hath most incomparably proved it for her in that his excellent Scholastick History of the Ca-

man of Scripture. And for Traditions, *He* rejects none but such, as have no evidence, nor probability of their ever having Been of use in the Primitive Church, or such as are of no moment; in which case I never saw reason, why the National Church of England hath not as much Authority herein to judge of these things, as the Church of Rome her self, who (for example sake) hath left off giving the Communion to Infants, tho' a Tradition of the Catholick Church.

pag. 3. So that I cannot for my Life see; what you would say, tho' most ridiculously, deduce from hence, that all with us resolved it self into the Judgment of a Private Spirit, and must be (I suppose you mean the Private Spirit must be, tho' your words are far from bearing it) the chief, or rather onely support of your Protestant Faith, &c. Since it is so palpably false, as I have just now shewn, nothing as to matters of Faith, Discipline, or Church Communion among us being either left to, or guided by, or depending upon any Man, how great, or how learned soever, his private Spirit; and so ridiculous, that I could not forgive it any Man, that had not abstracted himself from his reason: but to doe you right, you have almost a mind to come off it with your *Methought*; and I am content without being angry that it should pass for your thought, the abstracted-no-Religion Man's.

pag. 3. You go on to shew that you could not persuade your self that Scripture alone could be the Judge of Controversies, and resolve your doubts, when the Private Spirit was made the Judge of Scripture, &c. Let the private Spirit be excluded, will you admit it then? will you allow the Representative Church of England to interpret in new Emergencies, which fell not within the care of Antiquity and the Four General Councils? If you admit this, there need be no dispute, since long before your doubts, the Church of England hath by publick Authority interpreted the Scripture in all matters of Faith and Discipline, and tied up all her Members; hath in all the points of Controversie betwixt us and Rome determined, that the sense of the Scripture is directly against them, and for us: If you will not admit it, I should be glad to see one reason against it, that would not as fully fly in the face of the Church of Rome.

pag. 3, 4. As to the Mischief upon this Principle of the Private Spirit, the Wars and Murders, &c. You ought to have remembered that *tha,*

that Principle was not set up by, but against the Church of England, and that it was not the Church, but the direct and sworn Enemies thereof that committed all those outrages; you cannot be ignorant that it was *She only* that suffered during that Rebellion and Schism: and therefore it is most unjust in you to insinuate as if *She* was cause of all that distraction, whereas nothing is more apparent than the contrary to it. And as to your *Tantum Religio, &c.* I challenge you to shew any one Principle of the Church of England that encourages, or does but glance towards Rebellion, Sedition, or disturbance of either Church or State: This I'll promise you for every one, I'll shew you Ten of your new Church, I'll shew you Councils for it, your own most famous of all the European Councils, the Fourth of Lateran leading the Van. Your Popes deposing Princes, giving away their Kingdoms (as they have done ours more than once) setting up in Rebellion Son against Father. I'll shew you the Rebellious Holy League in France, one King most barbarously Murdered by it, a Pope [Sixtus Quintus] in a set Speech commending the Parricide: the Sorbone it self making Rebellious Decrees against the Two Harries of France, both Massacred by their Catholick (as they call themselves) Subjects; but enough of this, wherein you know or at least should, that we have infinitely the advantage of your new Church as to Principles of Loyalty. pag. 84.

The result it seems of your Inquiry and search among us was, that you could not comply with common reason if you did not disclaim the Judgment of your own, or any Man's private Spirit, &c. I have upon this but one Question to ask you, and that is how you came to be a Roman Catholick; if you disclaimed your own reason or private Spirit, pray who chose your guide or Church for you; if you disclaimed every ones else, pray tell us how any Body else could do it for you? But notwithstanding this your disclaiming, we find you busie enough up and down the Book acting as if you never had done any such thing, discovering, judging, complying, contemplating, searching and Forty such expressions which used to denote the exercise of a Man's private Judgment and Reason. pag. 4.

C H A P. V.

His Method farther exposed, and the ridiculous Fruits of it.

PAG. 4. **T**HE Fruit of all your search hitherto hath been onely to find, or at least to mistrust the ground you stood upon somewhat unsure, &c. What ground it was you then stood upon, I cannot guess, since before this you had abstracted your self from Religion, and supposed your self as of no Religion, so most certainly of no Church. But all this is assuredly but a figure to bring in the Rock, the Rock you think you were got upon, when once a Romanist. If I might have had a word with you before you had mounted your Rock, for now I am afraid there is no speaking with you, I would onely have been informed by you, whether there is but one Rock, and whether I must give (a) Origen the lie who tells me that all the Apostles were Rocks as well as Peter; and what I must say to (b) Tertullian and others, that tell me, other Apostles planted Churches as well as Peter and Paul at Rome; and that I might be as safe in any of them all, as in that at Rome, since they and Rome had the same Faith (as (c) Irenaeus says) delivered to them, and had a Ministry settled by Apostles among them. I wish I might be so happy as to have a satisfactory Answer to these Queries from you or any one else.

(*) Orig.
Hom. 1.
in Matth.
() Pre-
script. c. 32.
Cy 35. Edit.
Franck.
1597.
(*) Com.
Har. l. 1.
c. 2, 3.
Edit.
Feuard.
1625.

But for the present you are too busie, having got the Text, that the Gates of Hell should not prevail (which Text by the bye how came you to interpret of a Church, since if you disclaim your private Judgment, it does, for any thing you can know, relate to something else?) You are sure upon it that Christ hath a Church, that that Church has but one Faith; which I have already told you our Church does not deny. And now you wanted nothing to find firm footing (sure footing you should have called it for Mr. Serjeant's sake) but to discover, whether the Church from her Original was the Commissioned Interpreter of the Sacred Writings, &c.

PAG. 4

One would expect here in a thing of that moment some well managed Reasons from Scripture, Reason, and the Consent of Antiquity

signity to prove that the Church of Rome (which you cannot deny that you mean here,) was this Commissioned Interpreter ; but instead of that, you think you do it cleverly enough by insinuating that without it there would be no end of Controversies, which is not proving but begging. As to the choice of a Hundred Faiths (without such an Interpreter) which you say you saw pag. 5. you might have ; if you mean in the Church of England, and that you must mean, having already set aside all other Communions, and being now employed in the examining whether of the Two Churches, the Church of England or Rome, you might be safe with ; I am obliged to tell you that there are no fewer than Ninety Nine mistakes in this short Sentence, since the Faith of the Church of England is but one, and as much one as that of the Church of Rome her self.

But for all this talk you have not got to your Church yet, pag. 5. which must be Visible ; to wave needless Disputes, such the Church of England is as well as the Church of Rome. And now you want nothing but a definition of her, which you complain you could not get among us, and therefore was forced to go to the Books of Catholicks : As to the complaint I answer that you needed not to have gone to the Catholicks (as you call 'em) since the Church of England's definition in her Articles will I think, satisfie any reasonable Man, while ^(d) it defines ⁽⁴⁾ Article the Visible Church of Christ to be a Congregation of Faithfull [here 19. Hereticks and Schismaticks are both excluded] Men, in which the pure Word of God is Preached, and the Sacraments be duly Ministred according to Christ's Ordinance [and that must be by lawfull Pastors] in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same.

You could not but know of this Definition of the Church of Christ, you had done well to have shewn particularly, wherein it failed of separating Hereticks or Schismaticks from being either Flock or Shepherds in the Church. But no Ignorance is comparable to that which is affected. And since you would not be contented with ours, I'll e'en try S. N's. and see what reason it has to be prefer'd to that of the whole Church of England.

The Church of Christ is one Society or company of Men.

The Visible Church of Christ is a Congregation.

S. N.
Ch. of E.

Linked

S. N. *Linked and combined together in the same Profession of Christian Faith.*

Ch. of E. *Of Faithfull Men.*

S. N. *And use of Sacraments under lawfull Pastors.*

Ch. of E. *And the Sacraments be duly Administred according to Christ's Ordinance.*

Thus far we agree, as for S. N's addition of *those Pastors also under one Supreme Head Pastor or Conservator pacis & veritatis*, do you or he prove it, and then put it into the Definition; its being there now is no proof of the Truth of it. However you, I perceive, were satisfied with it, and think this Definition hath brought you to the Rock, hath done your business for you.

I have often heard indeed of Men disputed into a Church, of Men cajoled, and of others threatned or frightened into a Church; but must confess I never heard of any before you definitioned into a Church; and truly it looks surprizing that a Man should like a Church for a Definitions sake. Suppose your Definition prove false, are you resolved to leave that Church, and go to another that hath a better Definition? If this be your Humour, the Sophisters would be too hard for you, and lead you into an endless Maze. Satisfied however you are at present, and so overjoyed at this Definition, that you forgot what was necessary for it, and that was to prove and to confirm it; instead of which you fall into extravagant Praises, and a hurly of Words and Ecstasies to no purpose, whereas you neglect to prove, First, that this is a true and regular Definition, and Secondly, that it does belong to the Church of Rome so called exclusive of all other. Had you done this, you had acted like a Scholar, whereas the other rable of discoveries and abused Psalms prove nothing at all, and would far better have become some Woman, or Post-Convvert than you, who should prove these things, and let them which can doe no better, admire.

After your fit of Ecstasies is over, you seem something willing to afford us some Testimonies of Antiquity, to what purpose I must now inquire that so we may avoid Confusion, and I may shorten my Answers. But here according to my own design, I must take leave of your Method of resolving your self in your doubts, being arrived at that, which I took leave for order
and

and cleareness sake to call the *Reasons* of your Conversion, which convinced you so far, as to leave our *Communion*, and to espouse that of *Rome*. I will take leave of it with this Complement, that it really is the most admirable one I ever heard of for a Clergy-Man of above Threescore.

C H A P. VI.

His Proofs of a Monarchical Church under one Supreme Head from Scripture Answered.

THE Fruit of your noble Method, and the effect of all your Search hitherto hath been (as far as I can perceive) that you have met with a Definition that pleases you : Now except you take *S. N.* to be as infallible in making of Definitions, as the Pope is said by some (and perhaps believed by you) to be in making of Canons for the Church, and that you ought to submit to his Definition, just as you do to the Popes Decrees, with all submission, without any scruple, or examination, you know it will be expected from you to prove this his Definition to be true : I cannot dare to think you so much a Madman as to believe *S. N.*'s Infallibility at Definitions, and therefore now do wait for your proof of these two things.

First, That this your espoused Definition is true, that is, that Christ his Catholick Church is Monarchical, and governed supremely by one chief Pastor, his Generalissimo (a very fit Title in a literal sense for some of your Popes) or Vicegerent here on Earth ; and Secondly, That this Definition doth belong to the Church of Rome, and not to the Church of England : Do but prove me the first, and I'll forgive you the trouble of proving the Second, and bestow it on you, as a just reward for your pains about the first.

But before we begin, I must desire you to remember not to confound Particular Churches with the Catholick Church, and not to take that as said of the one, which does certainly belong to the other.

You begin your Proofs with Scripture, which a Man may easily

pag. 7.

fly see is not at all on your side, you give us *thence* so few, and *those* nothing to the purpose. For as to the first out of *Acts* the Second, Verse 1. how that which is onely an *Historical Relation* should be a *Heavenly Representation*, I cannot imagine. No Body will deny that they that meet as the *Apostles* then were, ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ, in one place [not ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ as you falsly quote it, and as ill translate it, at the same work] should be as the *Apostles* then were ὁμοθυμαδὸν of one accord, or of one mind; and which is more, that every *Particular Church* over the *World* should be as to the *Rule of Faith* ὁμοθυμαδὸν of one mind; but I can never believe that for this reason they are, can, or ought to be ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ, always meet at the same place, which your use of it would insinuate, and must require the one as well as the other for your purpose. But what this is to a *Monarchical Church* with a *supreme Head* I cannot guess; nor your other from *St. Pauls* frequent *Injunctions* to his several *Plantations*, that they should be all of one mind, and speak the same things. You had done well to have quoted some passages to have illustrated what you say, or at least to have put down some references in the *Margin*; but this alas was not convenient, then even those that swallow what you say without examining, could not avoid seeing the *Fallacy*; for whereas *St. Paul* writing to *Particular Churches* exhorts them to be at *Unity* among themselves, you would fain turn it as if he should exhort them as to all particulars and circumstances, to be at *Unity* or to have the same with the other Churches; as if writing to *Ephesus* for example, he should exhort them to be of the same mind, and to speak the same things with the *Church of Corinth*, with the *Church at Thessalonica*, &c. Shew this, and I'll yield the point; but remember that if you mean of the same mind and to speak the same things as to matters of Faith, this as it need not be proved, no Body gain-saying it, so it does no ways serve what you cited it for, to prove a *Monarchical Church*.

pag. 7.

It cannot appear otherwise than very strange to all considering Persons, that these People should generally with so much confidence affirm, that our *Saviour* left his *Church* in such a condition with a *Supreme Vicegerent* over it, and yet like you, when they should come to make the thing apparent from the *History* of those first times, penned in the *Gospels*, *Acts* and *Epistles*, are forc'd

forc'd to drop the proof of *it*, and to impose upon *their Readers* a *scrap* or two out of *those writings*, not one jot to the purpose oftentimes. You will easily find that I mean this of *you*; and I must needs say that these your two *useless proofs*, I mean *Quorations* for they are far from *Proofs*, forced me upon *this Remark*.

CHAP. VII.

His Arguments for a Monarchical Church out of Antiquity refuted.

ONE comfort however you seem to promise us, that you will make *your Reader* amends by your *Testimonies* out of the *Fathers* for your being so short, and so destitute of 'em from *Scripture*. You begin them in a quaint stile, which I believe you took for a pretty fancy. *I followed (say you) I must* pag. 7. *confess a loof off, her [the Kings Daughter all glorious within] Companions, that followed her, &c.* This passage is one of the pleasantest that I ever met with, and the fullest of Figure: I must profess, till I saw your *Book*, I always took *St. Dennis, Ignatius, Irenaus, &c.* for *Members* of the Church, and never in the least dreamed that these persons were *her Companions*, or the *Virgins* that are *her Fellows*: and I must own that it is the first time I ever heard of a *Members* being a *companion* to the *Body*, or that a *Man* without the breach of common sense may say that *his Hand* or *Foot* is a *Companion* of his *Body*.

But you, Sir, had been contemplating just before the ravishing Beauty of the *Kings Daughter all glorious within*: and the *Virgins* that be *her Fellows* and *Companions* did so run in your head, that 'tis no wonder you mistook *Dennis* the *Areopagite* and the rest you mention after him for the *Queens Companions*. At present however we must let them pass as *such*, whom you followed you tell us and *listened* what they said of her, and overheard, First, *Dionysius* the *Areopagite* *St. Pauls Scholar*. Secondly, *Clemens Romanus, &c.*

'Tis commonly said it's ominous stumbling at the Threshold, and a bad preface to trip at the first attempt, and this truly is your very case, for it is a great mistake you should overhear either of them two using those passages you mention, since neither of

them ever said the things, St. Dennis having never left any thing writ at all, nor St. Clemens any thing besides his two (allowing the fragment of the Second to be his) Epistles. So that your two first quotations are pitifull Forgeries, as I shall hereafter prove: but granting the passages were true, and as old as you would have 'em: they are not one jot to your purpose. The first of 'em saying onely that the Apostles desired their followers by their Instructions might be partakers of the Divine Nature; the latter, that Bishops should observe the Orders left by the Apostles; both which are nothing to the purpose of a Monarchical Church, but prove the contrary, if it were worth the while to shew it.

pag. 7.

pag. 8.

pag. 8.

Ignatius Saint and Martyr is the next you produce, from him you tell us, that People in all things should submit to their Bishop, that no Man can be partaker of the Eucharist, that abstains from the Bishops Altar. A Man would guess by these passages, that you had already forgot, what you were about to prove. You were to prove that Christ left his Church under one particular Government, and here you prove that People must be dutifull to their

pag. 8.

Bishops. Ay but say you, St. Ignatius tells us there is but one Altar, and one Bishop, as also that there ought to be but one Church and one Faith, which is in Christ, &c. and that surely is to the purpose. This I utterly deny, I grant indeed St. Ignatius in his Epistle to the Philadelphians [not as you have mistaken it, to the Philippians; to which Church he wrote no Epistle, tho' some have coined one for him] doth speak of one Altar and one Bishop; and you had done fairly to have cited the passage at large, as you did the other two, nothing to the purpose; but this is a certain sign that runs almost through your Book, that where you onely hint, or quote half, or put an &c. in the middle of a Sentence there all things will not be found fair. The passage then is this,

(2) Be carefull therefore (saith he speaking to the Philadelphians) to make use of this one Eucharist: for there is but one Flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, and one Cup to Communicate to us [or unite us to] his Blood: one Altar, as but one Bishop with the Presbyters and Deacons my fellow-servants; that whatever ye do, ye may all according to Gods appointment.

(*) οὐκ ἔστιν ἑνὸς
ἐκκλησίας
ἑνὸς ἑυ-
χαριστίας
ἑνὸς κυρίου,
ἑνὸς
ἀλλ' ἓν

Κυρίου ἑνὸς ἑκκλησίας, καὶ ἓν τοῦ κυρίου τοῦ ἑνὸς τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ αἵματος ἐν συνάκρῳ, οὐκ ἔστι
ἑνὸς κυρίου τοῦ ἑκκλησίας καὶ διακόνων—ἑνὸς ὁ ἑνὸς πρεσβυτέρου, καὶ ἑνὸς πρεσβυτέρου.
St. Ignat. Ep. ad Philadelph. Edit. J. Vossii.

Now

Now *this passage* is so far from proving what you would have it, that there is but *one Supreme Bishop*, who you say is *he* of *Rome*, that it asserts the *direct contrary*, for if it proves, as you say it does, that there is but *one Altar* and *one Bishop*, I am as certain that it proves that *one Bishop* to be the *Bishop of Philadelphia*, and that *one Altar* to be this *Bishops*, since he exhorts these *Philadelphians* to make use and keep to that *Eucharist*, that was to be received from that *one Altar*, that did belong to that *one Bishop*: and that *one Bishop* I am sure was the then *Bishop of Philadelphia*. I will not urge upon you any place of *Ignatius*, but will only say, and will be at any time ready to prove, that he that cites *Ignatius* for a defender of a *Monarchical Church* under *one Head on Earth*, either hath not read *Ignatius*, or does not understand him.

What you urge from *St. Cyprian* is to no purpose, since every one owns that every *Member* ought to keep the *Unity* of that *Church* to which he doth belong, and that no *Man* that is disobedient to the *Church his Mother*, will ever have God for his Father. Nor your long quotation from *St. Irenaeus*, where your faculty pag. 8. of translating appears to be none of the best, *This Preaching and this Faith*, when the *Church* had heard spread through the whole *World*, she diligently keeps, as it were dwelling in one *House*; to wit, having one *Soul* and one *Heart*, &c. which give me leave to alter a little to *St. Irenaeus* his good sense, and then you shall have my Answer about it. The [*Catholick*] *Church* having received this *Preaching* and this *Faith*, although [she be] dispersed over the whole *World*, yet keeps and preserves them as diligently, as if she [were confined to or] did Inhabit a single *House*; and she doth believe them without any difference or disagreement, as tho' she had but one *Soul*, and but one *Heart*, and accordingly doth both preach, teach, and deliver these things, [these *Articles of Faith*] as if she had but one *Mouth*, &c. Of all the passages in *Antiquity*, I wonder what ill Fate put this piece of *St. Irenaeus* in your way: had you considered it well, I am sure we should not have met with it in your *Book*, since it does perfectly ruine the whole design of this part of your *Book*; for whereas the benefit you intended from it was to help you to prove that the *Church of Christ* is *Monarchical* under a single head, there is nothing less here, and every thing contrary; for as it speaks of the *Catholick Church*, as one through this

Unity.

Unity of Faith, so it proves (what we of the Church of England so much contend for) that the Particular Churches of Germany, Spain, France, Ægypt and the East, of Lybia, Jerusalem, Rome, and the rest, do make up this Catholick Church, without the least hint of a Head over them all, or of any other Unity than that of Faith, the Light that doth, like the Sun, equally enlighten every where. You will say perhaps that the Church of Rome is not expressly mentioned here, and that probably it is, because all these Particular Churches mentioned are the several parts of her Body which really is the same as the Catholick Church.

But to spoil this groundless Pretence, not to insist on it that by the Churches constituted in the middle of the World in this passage, She as well as Jerusalem, and the Churches betwixt them is certainly intimated; I desire you but to peruse the Third Chapter of his Third Book against Heresies. Having in the beginning of this Chapter urged against the Hereticks that none of the Apostles delivered to the Bishops their Successours any such things as they impiously taught, and that he could shew this from the

*---neque ha-
que in Me-
dio Mundi
sunt consti-
tuta.*

^b Sed quoniam valde longum est in hoc tali volumine Omnium Ecclesiarum enumerare Successiones, — Roma fundata & constituta Ecclesia — Traditionem, &c. St. Irenæus l. 3. c. 3. contr. Heres. Edit. Feuardent. 1625.

Successions in all the Churches, he thus addresses them, ^b But because it is too tedious in such a Volume as this is to reckon up the Successions of all Churches, &c. he then reckons up that of the very great and very ancient Church founded at Rome by St.

Peter and St. Paul, &c. If this passage do not prove the Church of Rome to be one of all those Churches, and as Particular a Church, as any of the rest, I will for the future (as you did) abstract my self, and deny my Eyes as well as my Reason.

What you quote from Clemens of Alexandria and Tertullian, two of whose passages are part falsely, and part lamely translated) are nothing at all to your purpose, they only speak of the Catholick Church as one through the Unity of Faith, not a word of the Church of Rome, or of her being that one Church under one Head Bishop.

The same advantage and no more doth that from St. Chrysostom afford you, which says, The Apostle calls it the Church of God, that he may shew it may be reduced into one [which with your leave I would express thus, to shew, or having shewed, that it ought to be at Unity, &c.] All which is no more than what the

pag. 9.

pag. 9.

pag. 9.

pag. 9.

pag. 9.

pag. 9.

pag. 9.

the *Members of the Church of England* have said a Hundred Thousand times, that *every Church*, as well as *that at Corinth* ought to be at *Unity*.

You might have quoted our *Collect for all Conditions of Men* p. 9.
[*O God, the Creatour and Preserver of all Mankind, &c.*] instead of the passage out of *Theodoret*, onely you had a mind to shew your great reading, otherwise *ours* would have served you to all the purposes *this* can, they both saying the *same thing*, that is, not one syllable to your intentions. *St. Ambrose's* and *St. Hierome's* are just the same, speaking that which *none of our Church* can deny, every member of it doth believe that there is *one Catholick and Apostolick Church*, and at the same time is as ready to profess, that *he* doth no more believe than any of the *Primitive Christians* ever did, that the *Church of Rome* is *that Church*, or that *that one Catholick and Apostolick Church* is governed by *one Supreme Pastour the Bishop of Rome*; which was the thing you were to prove, but how little you have performed it, I dare appeal to any one, that would but, as *he* reads, consider, and compare *your quotations*, and what I have said upon them.

More *Testimonies*, it seems, you could have given us, but you p. 10.
say, it were too tedious, either to write or read, &c. There is another reason why they would be tedious, and that is, because if they are no better than these we have had already, they would have been nothing to the purpose: and to say those *Testimonies* you have presented us are not the best, would be to disparage your prudence and parts, which we need not doe. One more however you cannot refrain giving us for good omens sake, that of *Constantine the Great*, whose Zeal for the Unity of the *Catholick Church*, and his most earnest endeavours for the peace thereof all know and admire, and therefore 'twas needless to recite, since it hath not one syllable to your business, which was not to prove, what both sides affirm, that there is a *Catholick Church*, but that the *Church of Rome* is *that Catholick Church* governed by *one Supreme Pastour*. *Quod restat probandum & æternum restabit.*

One thing I must desire of you by reason of these passages, that if ever you set up again for a *Writer*, you would either tell us what Editions the Books are of which you quote; or name the Books you pick'd

pick'd 'em out of; you cite the 62d Chapter; *Valesius's Edition* says it's the 64th: you quote the 63d, and he says it's the 65th Chapter of *Ensebius's* 3d Book of the *Life of Constantine*.

C H A P. VIII.

The Ridiculousness of his Attempt against Protestant Communions exposed, and an Unity of Faith among them proved.

pag. 10.

HERE, as tho' you had done wonders by your Authorities, you not without a secret vain-glory, say, *What would I have once given to have found such an Unity amongst Protestants? to have England, Scotland, Denmark, Zwethland, Geneva, Zurick, &c. thus Unius Labii: nay to have found but one County in my own dear Countrey, or perhaps one single Family so united a Brotherhood, &c.* I wish, Sir, that it might have been my good fortune to have met you sometime with money in your Pocket in this generous mood, I do assure you that I would have been reasonable, and for one Guinea, would have proved it to you, or have forfeited 40, that all these Churches you have reckoned up in the North and Western parts of Europe are as much *Unius Labii*, as all the Proofs you have tack'd together do either prove or require; for to repeat the substance of them, there is none of them all doth either prove, or offer at it, that all the Particular Churches of Christ should have the same Customs, Rites, Ceremonies and Discipline without any difference one from another. That which they prove, and indeed there is but one that doth it clearly, that from *Irenaeus*, is, that the Unity of the Catholick Church dispersed throughout the world, or, which is the same thing, of all the Particular Churches every where which do make up the Catholick Church was in and from the one Faith, which she had from the Apostles: and this Faith was that which we call the *Apostle's Creed*, a Summary of which *St. Irenaeus* having set down in the short Chapter immediately before this out of which you have your quotation, begins this Chapter as you have quoted that the Catholick Church, having received this Preaching and this Faith (to wit, included in the *Apostle's Creed*, doth preserve it, and teach it inviolably, &c. and

and at the end of this same Chapter, ^c he tells us, that the Church was so much *Unius Labii* (as your phrase is) in this Faith, that neither He that was more eloquent among the Pastours of the Church, will say [or teach] any things different from these [Articles of Faith] for no Man is above his Master: nor he that is less expert, will diminish any thing from this [Faith delivered or] Tradition. For since the Faith is one and the

same, neither he that can say most about it, doth add any thing to it; nor he that can say least, doth take any thing from it. This Faith then (to use St. Irenaus's simile) like the Sun, enlightens all parts *Ibidem.* of the world, shines to them all, and doth influence all with her one Faith, as with a common heat, and makes all that embrace it throughout the world to become the constituent parts of the Catholick Church.

By this time I do not question but that you think your *Guinea* might have been in danger, since no man that hath common sense can deny, that the Churches of England, Denmark, Sweden and the rest are *Unius Labii* in this Faith, which is equally embraced and professed by them, and therefore hath the same influence over them, that it had over the several Churches in St. Irenaus his time, to make them true Members of the Catholick Church. So that as all your money would have been lost on this account, so your Pity over your own dear Countrey is not onely lost but childish and ridiculous too, and would far handsomer have become a Woman that never saw farther than her Psalter, than you that pretend to such a large knowledge in Fathers and Divinity.

But tho' your Pity were lost, you are resolved your Countrey *pag. 10,* shall not want your hearty prayers, that true Charity — may possess *11.* their hearts, and that there may be a most holy love planted, and reigning in their hearts for ever, &c. I used to think it was the opinion of the Church of Rome and her Party, that we of the Church of England wanted the true Faith, if so, you are not then so charitable for all your Pretences as you might be, and a little petition, that true Faith, as well as true Charity may possess our hearts, would not be so very much, or so troublesome for you, now you are on your Rock, to put up for us. But perhaps your opinion is,

E

that

^c Et neque qui valde praevalet in Sermone ex iis qui praesunt Ecclesiis, alia quam hac sunt, dicet. Nemo enim super Magistrum est: neque infirmus in dicendo deminorabit Traditionem. Cum enim una & eadem fides sit, neque is qui multum de ea potest dicere, amplius, (Lampliat) neque is qui minus, deminorat. S. Iren. c. Hæc. l. 1. c. 3. Edit. Fcuard.

that *our Faith* is good enough in *this Church*, onely that we are an *ill-natured, uncharitable Church*, and therefore want *such an Oratour* as *you* to obtain for us the *Gift of Charity*. But do we want *Charity* so much more, than *our neighbours at Rome*? God will one day judge, and let the world doe it in the mean time, whether we or *they* want it more, *they* that damn all besides their own Church, or we that hold that *even they may be saved*. And for *our Faith* neither shall we need to flatter *our selves*; by and by we shall be called to account by *you* about it, and proved to our sorrow to want that altogether as much as *Charity*, so that in the mean time how are *you* the *compassionate, and charitable Man*?

'Tis no wonder that one that hath made so great a mistake, as to say, there is *no Unity* among the *Reformed Communions*, should make such adoe to make the *Church of Rome* appear great, by reckoning up all the *Universities, Bishopricks, &c.* that own and submit to the *Pope's Jurisdiction*. I have not so much time to trifle away as to examine whether your *Muster* be right; all that it proves is, that a great many Churches that by the *Rules of Christianity*, and by the *ancient Laws of the Catholick Church* were free and independent, do now labour (willingly or unwillingly I do not pretend to know) under the *Usurpation* of the *Church of Rome* and her *Universal Bishop*, which *Title Gregory the Great*, himself a *Bishop* of that *See*, thought *Antichristian*. When you reckon *Sicily* and its *Bishops*, you ought to have remembered, that *they* have a *Supreme Head* of their own, the *King of Spain* (who is therefore once a year excommunicated by the other *Supreme Head* at *Rome*, but, for quietness sake, as constantly the next day absolved) who acts as supremely and Independently there, as the *Pope* himself does in *Rome* or any part of *Italy*. But this perchance you did not know, and therefore 'twould be very unreasonable to expect a true account of it from *you*.

C H A P. IX.

A Digression, wherein is proved that the Church of Rome is a particular Church, and that the Unity among the Primitive Churches was in Faith onely.

YOUR next design, if I understand you right, is to prove the Supremacy of the Bishop of Rome. But before I undertake to talk with you about that, I will take leave to make a Digression, the Design of which shall be to shew you (that I may not be onely employed in pulling down what you build) how much you have been mistaken about your Notion of the Catholick Church, and how miserably that Definition of *S. N.* or rather the Romish Missionaries have imposed upon you. I will contract it as much as I can, and care not how short I am, so that I be but clear and intelligible.

The things therefore I propose to make appear are these,

First, That the Church of Rome in the Primitive times was looked upon to be as particular a Church, as any other then in being.

Secondly, That as an Unity in Faith was always required in every Particular Church to make it a true branch of the Catholick Church, so there were in those Primitive times always found, and always allowed of, differences as to Practices, Ceremonies, Discipline and such things between the several particular Churches without any breach of Catholick Peace and Unity.

1. The first of these I am almost as much ashamed to attempt, as to prove that I had a Mother, it is so plain and visible through all Antiquity: that I admire any Man that owns his Reason can in the least question the Church of Rome's being as Particular a Church as any of its neighbours; such I am sure St. Paul thought it to be, when he wrote his Epistle from Corinth to that Church, and such St. Clemens knew it certainly to be, when he writes in the name of the Church settled at Rome the famous Epistle to the Church of Corinth: the Epistle St. Ignatius wrote to it, just before his Martyrdom there, does equally prove it with

the other two, and not one syllable is there to be met with in these three best Monuments of Antiquity (as far as I can see) that does at all advance her above the common level of the other her sister Churches, or in the least hint her any ways being the Mistress, or Mother of them all, as the late and our modern Wise-men are pleased to say she is, but for proving it are willing to be excused.

I question not but what I have cited out of St. Irenæus proves the sentiment of him and his time to have been, that she was a particular Church among the rest in the world; he was certainly of this opinion, when telling the Hereticks that it would be too tedious to reckon up the Successions of ALL the CHURCHES, he puts down that of Rome, which he could not have done, had not she been one of those All he there mentions. I will but

“—Edant ergo Origines Ecclesiarum suarum : evoluant ordinem Episcoporum suorum ita per Successiones ab initio decurrentem, ut primus ille Episcopus aliquem ex Apostolis vel Apostolicis viris, Græc. habuerit auctorem & antecessorem. Hoc enim modo Ecclesiæ Apostolicæ census suos deserunt : sicut Smyrnæorum Ecclesia habens Polycarpum ab Joanne conlocatum refert : Sicut Romanorum Clementem a Petro ordinatum edit : proinde utique & ceteræ exhibent, Græc. Tertull. de Præscript. c. 32. Edit. Franck. 1597.

produce one more upon this too evident a point, Tertullian^d, who challenging the Hereticks to shew the Original of their Churches, the Succession of their Bishops in a direct line from either an Apostle, or an Apostolical Person that always kept within the Unity of the Church; tells them the Apostolical Churches could doe this; for example the Church of Smyrna that had Polycarp placed there [for their first Bishop] by St. John, the Church of Rome that had Clemens ordained by St. Peter, and for the rest of those Churches, that they did the same.

2. I'll pass now to the second point, to shew, That as an Unity in Faith was always required in every Particular Church to make it a true part of the Catholick Church, so there were in those primitive times always found, and always allowed of, Differences as to Practice and Ceremonies, Discipline and such things between the several particular Churches without any breach of Catholick Peace and Unity.

As to the Unity by Faith, I need not much, if at all, insist upon the proof of it, since we both make it necessary to the being a Member of the Catholick Church : St. Irenæus in the Chapter you and I quoted, doth sufficiently prove that it was the Faith

S. Irenæus
cont. Har.
l. 1. c. 3.

Faith received from the Apostles, that made the Church one; that it was that which enlightened, and therefore saved every particular Church as well as particular Person: No Man speaks more of the beauty and necessity of Unity, and yet that He meant it only as to an Unity of Faith, is very apparent from that famous Epistle to Victor Bishop of Rome, who had most imprudently and irregularly excommunicated the Asiatick Churches for not keeping Easter at the same time He and most other Christians did.

In this Epistle he tells Victor that before his time, All Churches tho' several of 'em differing in this thing of the time of observing Easter preserved Catholick Peace, and did communicate one with another, notwithstanding such a difference. He

gives him the Instance (in this same Ep.) of St. Polycarp and Anicetus, who differing and resolved so to continue in this point, did most lovingly communicate together at Rome it self: Anicetus, as a particular mark of Honour and Brotherly Love, permitting St. Polycarp to Consecrate the Eucharist in his Church and stead: and did as lovingly part. He further informs him, that it was not about

the time of observing Easter only that there were Differences between particular Churches: he mentions the much greater variety in the great duty of Fasting, that some fasted but one Day, some two, others more: yet did however preserve Peace and Unity with all that differed from them; and so he says, they still did continue to do in his time: and concludes this Narrative thus, That the Diversity of their Fasts did commend the Unity of their Faith; than which I could never desire a more evident proof for what I have affirmed, that different Customs were found and allowed of in the different particular Churches without breach of Catholick Unity and Communion.

*Tertullian is as express in both points of the Unity of Faith, and diversity of Discipline and Customs, that tho' the first is necessary to all Churches, yet that the other is lawfull and practised in different Communions. * The Rule of Faith (says he) is altogether one, immovable, and incapable of any Reformation or Altera-*

Neque enim de Die (viz. celebr. Pasch.) solum controversia est, sed etiam de formâ ipsa Jejunii. Quidam enim existimant unico die sibi esse jejunandum: alii duobus, alii pluribus — nihilominus tamen & omnes isti pacem inter se retinuerunt, & nos invicem retinemus. Ita Jejuniorum Diversitas Consensionem [εὐνοίας] Fidei commendat. apud Euseb. Hist. Eccl. l. 5. c. 24. Ed. Vales.

** Regula quidem Fidei una omnino est, sola immobilis & irreformabilis, credendi scilicet in unicum Deum. —*
tion.

Hac Lege Fidei manente cetera jam disciplina & conversationis admittunt novitatem correctionis. Tertul. de Virgin. veland. c. 1. Edit. Franck.

continuing firm, the other matters of Discipline and Manners do admit of Correction or Amendment. These two eminent Writers are so clear and convincing in this matter, that I'll wave the producing any more Authorities to this purpose besides that of the very eminent and famous Firmilian Bishop of the Cappado-

† Eos autem qui Romæ sunt, non ea in omnibus observare quæ sunt ab origine tradita, & frustra Apostolorum auctoritatem prætere; scire qui etiam inde potest, quod circa celebrandos dies Paschæ, & circa multa alia divina rei Sacramenta, videat esse apud illos aliquos diversitates, nec observari illis omnia equaliter quæ Hierosolymis observantur. Secundum quod in cæteris quoque plurimis Provinciis, multa pro locorum & nominum (liberorum) diversitate variantur; nec tamen propter hoc ab Ecclesia Catholica pace atque unitate aliquando discessum est. Firmiliani Epistola Cypriano, inter Epist. Cypriani 75. p. 220. Edit. Oxon.

the Peace and Unity of the Catholic Church, by breaking Com-

Cum una sit Fides, cur sint Ecclesiarum di-

versa consuetudines, &c.

tion, after which he sets down an Abridgment [as Irenæus had done above] of the Apostles Creed, and then proceeds *hac Lege, &c.* This Law or Rule of Faith

Discipline and Manners do admit of Correction or Amendment. These two eminent Writers are so clear and convincing in this matter, that I'll wave the producing any more Authorities to this purpose besides that of the very eminent and famous Firmilian Bishop of the Cappado-
cian Cæsarea, † who in an Epistle to St. Cyprian, acquaints the World, that they of the Romish Church did not observe in all things what had been delivered from the beginning (I pray then what's become of your Palladium, Tradition) and that they did to no purpose pretend the Authority of the Apostles : he instances about the Observation of Easter, and lays further to their charge some differences about many other divine affairs and administrations, and says that they do not observe the same Customs that are at Jerusalem. This he mentions not to blame them for them, but to reprove their Pride and their disturbing

the Catholic Church, by breaking Communion with other Churches upon such accounts, for in the next words to these I cite, himself mentions that in very many other Provinces, many things were varied according to the diversity of places and names, (men) however that the Peace and Unity of the Catholic Church was not hereby broken ; ὅτις ἰδοὺ δὲξεται.

3. Interrogatio Augustini ad Gregor. M.

CHAP. X.

An inquiry into Roman Unity under their Dictator.

HAVING now discharged my self of my digression, and satisfactorily I hope proved *that which I undertook in it.* I do now pass to your *Muster* of all those places and persons under the Pope, the Unity of which, your assurance is, doth hence proceed, *because they submit themselves to the Judgment and Regulation of one Dictator, who conserves the ancient Decrees of General Councils, deposited with him by the whole Church, from whom if any dissent, or walk irregularly, he is severed and cut off from the rest of the Members, &c.* p. 11.

That the *submission* of all those Churches you mention to the Dictator at Rome, is the cause of that Unity you say is among them, no Body does deny any more, than that all the Philosophers among the Heathens would have been as much at Unity, had they made *Aristippus* or *Pyrrho* their Universal Dictator, and resolved never to think, speak or write besides what he was pleased to command or teach them. The Question betwixt us is, whether Christ did leave his Church in a Monarchical State under the sole ordering of St. Peter at first, to be continued after his decease under the successive Bishops of Rome; and this is the thing to be proved; as for what you talk about the Roman Dictators keeping and managing the Canons of General Councils, I question not before we part upon this head to prove your Reasons for it either false, or ridiculous.

But before we go any further, is the Church of Rome really at that Unity that one might expect from its having such an Universal Dictator over it? I trow not; for did you never hear of that long bandying (which perhaps is not ended) about the Immaculate Conception; nor of the violent Feuds betwixt the Jansenists and Molinists, which for all the Popes determination continue to this Day? Is that whole Community agreed about the Infallibility? How is it then that some are for the Personal Infallibility of the Bishop of Rome as such; some that He is so one-ly,

ly in *Cathedra* ; some that onely a *General Council* is such ? Are they agreed about his *Jurisdiction* ? How is it then that some put him under, and others above a *General Council* ? Is his *Supremacy* determined wherein it doth consist ? Whence is it then that the *Clergy* of *France* so lately made *Determinations* for the *Limitation* of it, and to deny his *Deposing Power*, or *Medling* in *Temporals* : And the *Clergy* of *Hungary* under the *Arch-Bishop* of *Gran* did 1684 Condemn the *Determinations* of *France*, to omit the *Inquisition* of *Toledo* doing the same thing against them ? What was the reason that the *Pope*, who is *Dictator*, and might with a word as such silence these *Quarrels*, suffers these contrary *Determinations*, but that he hath wit enough to know that he is not so much a *Dictator*, as *Mr. Sclater* makes him, in *France*, and that his *Bulls* would signifie no more there about these things, than they did about the *Regale*. Are not the *Professed Members* of that *Communion* for all their *Dictator* still quarrelling and bandying one against another, witness the *Satyrs* and virulent *Libels* betwixt the *Jesuites* and the *Carmelites*, to pass by the more personal ones betwixt *Maimbourg* and *Schelscreat*, betwixt *Alexander Natalis* and *D'enghien*, betwixt *Arnauld* and *Malebranch* ; I will but ask you one question, why all *F. Alexandre Noel's* Books, wherein he hath done all he can to vindicate their *Religion*, were all condemned to the *Fire* not excepting one by this *Pope's Breve* in *Eighty Four*. I doubt we shall find that *Doctors* differ about the *deposing Power* and the *Popes Supremacy* in the bosome of the *Church* of *Rome* it self : and that the *French* did not submit quietly to the *Condemnation* of their *Determinations* by the *Clergy* of *Hungary*.

These things perchance are most of 'em news to you, and therefore you cannot be blamed for thinking or writing that they are at *Unity* under their *Dictator* at *Rome*, because you knew no better ; but if you be angry and say you did know them, I desire to know how you could say that the *Members* of that *Church* do submit to that *Dictator*, and are at *Unity* under him, whereas the *Instances* I have given are more than enough to convince, that what you have written is but a *Dream*, and your own confident mistake.

CHAP. II.

Arguments from the Three first Centuries and the beginning of the Fourth, for St. Peter's Supremacy, answered.

TO leave this and proceed in your Book, your business being as I told you above, to prove that *Christ* left his Church in a *Monarchical State* under the sole ordering of *St. Peter* at first, to be continued after his decease under the successive *Bishops of Rome*: It is strange to see how confusedly you go about it, but much stranger that you should begin with *St. Dennis*, and not with the *Scripture*. But I am afraid this Book is self, as well as the private Spirit that used to sense it, are now distast-ed by you alike, and that it is look'd upon as a far more dangerous than usefull Book, and so fittest to be set aside, where there is no absolute necessity of bringing it upon the Stage.

For your Testimony from *St. Dennis*, you know my mind already, and we shall have occasion by and by to talk a little more about him. *St. Irenæus* his Testimony had come in I think, a little better under your last Head among your Testimonies for the *Unity* of the *Catholick Church*. But how it proves *St. Peters Supremacy* I cannot devise, except you can prove that *St. Peter* and *St. Paul* were but *One Individual*, and make them two into one Man, as (p. 76.) you have made *Scotus Erigena* into two: Nor is there a word here about *Supremacy*; all that *Irenæus* saith is, & that *St. Peter* and *St. Paul* by their joint endeavours having founded that Church made *Linus Bishop* there, &c. which place seems to (if it really do not) exclude *St. Peters* being Bishop there himself at all, so far is it from proving his Supremacy.

But if it will not serve for this purpose, lets see what it will do for to prove the *Catholick Church* to be *Monarchical*, and no other than the Church of *Rome*. You found (say you) *Irenæus* [I'll venture to put in, saying, for without it or such a word

Ἡ Θεολογία τοῦ ἱεροῦ καὶ οἰκουμένης
αὐτοῦ: οἱ μαγιστοὶ Ἀπόστολοι τὴν Ἐκ-
κλησίαν [viz. Romæ.] Δίωκον τὴν τῆς
Ἐπισκοπῆς λειτουργίαν ἐν ἐκείνῳ.
Iren. c. Har. l. 3. c. 3. Edit. Fœuard.

F

I must

I must confess that I cannot make English out of your Period,] that it was of necessity that every Church should agree with the Church of Rome, &c. Your translation here I cannot admit, for *convenire ad hanc Ecclesiam* is surely to come up to this Church; the reason of which St. Irenaeus makes the *potentior Principalitas* (which I wonder you should omit in your Translation) the more powerfull Principality, the Supreme Civil Government, Rome then being the Imperial City of the World, and the Seat of the Senate and chief Judicatures, which must of necessity bring People, Christians as well as others, thither from all parts, and therefore make the Church of Rome a most visible and eminent Church, and so the fittest for St. Irenaeus his design against the Hereticks, when he had obliged himself to reckon up the Succession of one among the several Apostolical Churches of the World.

I am not ignorant your now party are very earnest upon this place, and very desirous to have it believed that by *potentior Principalitas* here is meant the Dignity and Jurisdiction of the Church at Rome over all other Churches, and that therefore they should resort to her as to their Head and Mistress. But not to insist on the Inconsistency of such a sense of these words with all the accounts we have of this and the rest of the Apostolical Churches from the purest Antiquity (which I could easily shew, had I room here,) I onely ask them, what every Church was to go thither for? Was it for the Catholick Faith? that St.

^b *Traditionem igitur Apostolorum in toto mundo manifestatam in Omni Ecclesia adest perspicere omnibus qui, &c. Iren. con. Her. l. 3. c. 3.*

^h Irenaeus assures us they, every one had at home, the Apostles after their Churches planted delivering to them the true Faith, which then was kept as he assures us, inviolably by them, and therefore no need to

go to Rome for it. Was it for Discipline? There was as little need for their going about this as for the other, since in the several Churches which they planted, the Apostles ordained them Bishops, delivering to them ^k *suum ipsorum locum Magisterii*, their own place and power of Jurisdiction, which certainly was for Discipline. If they of your Party can invent any other business for their going thither, I do not question but that any of our Writers will be able to refell it, as soon as mentioned.

^h *Idem Ibidem.*

By

By this time you have taken leave of *St. Peter*, and are got to *that*, which you will begin again *two pages hence*, to prove the Primacy did not *dye with Peter*; for Method truly I cannot but admire you: but must however take your Arguments, as they come. Well then you say of *St. Clemens*, that under him a great dissention arising among the *Corinthians*, He wrote powerful Letters [I wish you had told us how many, *Eusebius* that had almost as good opportunities as you, heard but of one, and we commonly think it was but one that he wrote on this account] to them, compelling them to Peace, repairing their Faith, and declaring what Tradition they had lately received from the Apostles, &c. This Testimony to give it its due, if it can but pass Muster, will do your business, this compelling looks as if a Generalissimo had to do about it, and this repairing their Faith shews as clear as the Sun, that the Bishops of Rome had the sole keeping of the Apostolical Faith and Tradition, that so if any Church had lost it, they might know whither to go to have it repaired; a much nobler Province than that of conserving the ancient Decrees of General Councils.

But is all this certainly true? why did you not then give us the passages where *St. Clemens* is so brisk upon the *Corinthians*? no Sir, if you had, they must have been of your own making, for I am pretty certain there is no such behaviour in that letter, but the direct contrary. I have particularly perused it upon this very occasion, and can meet with nothing, but *suasory Arguments* there, such as might have become any other Bishop as well as him; and therefore I must take the freedom to tell you, that I do not believe you have read this Epistle over, and that it was those you transcribed that imposed upon you, as you have done upon your Reader: and the same opinion I must have of your next Testimony from *Tertullian*, for could any but one that is a stranger to that particular Book (as well as to the rest of his Writings, as I believe I shall find you) quote him calling the Bishop of Rome *Pontifex Maximus*, Bishop of Bishops, *bonus Pastor* and *benedictus Papa*, when the Bishop of Rome is not once mentioned in this Tract; but granting him to be aimed at there, is it not as plain that all these Titles are given purely in derision [and therefore prove nothing to your purpose] by *De Pud.* *Tertullian* now a Heretic, and in this Tract ridiculing the civil

discipline of the *Catholick Church*? You might with as good a face have cited St. *Cyprian* and the *African Bishops* in Council with him calling the *Bishop of Rome* *Bishop of Bishops*, for him I verily believe they meant there, tho' they did not name him : but that there was such a sting in the tail of these *Bishops Preface* to their Council, as would have spoiled all your designs, and have blown away all your groundless talk about a *Supremacy* ; for after they had resolved to give their own opinions concerning what they were met about, without judging others, or denying to communicate with those that might be of a different Judgment, and had said that none of them made himself *Bishop of Bishops*, or attempted to fright any of their *Brother-Bishops* into an *Obedience*, or *Submission* to their Opinion, (by which expressions they more than seem to wipe the *Bishop of Rome*) they give the reason of this their temper and moderation, because every *Bishop*—had his own *Free-will*, and could no more be judged by another [the *Bishop of Rome* himself not excepted,] than judge another [*Bishop*] and upon this conclude for themselves, that they must all expect the Judgment of our Lord *Jesus Christ*, who alone had the power as of making them *Bishops* for the Government of his Church, so of calling them to an account for their discharge of the care and employment he had placed them in.

There is no one that hath read St. *Cyprian* and considered him, that will not grant I might easily bring twenty places as evident as this for the *Equality* and *Independency* of *Bishops* : But I must remember my task is to answer yours, not to write a Book on this subject. However this I could not omit thereby to obviate your quotation from him as if he should say the

pag. 12.
¹ *Cyprian* Church of *Rome* is the *Mother* and *Root* of the *Catholick Church*,
Epistola 45 whereas his advice (as he tells *Cornelius* here) to those persons
Cornelio was, upon his having communicated to them the *Legality* of
Edit. Oxon. *Cornelius* his *Ordination* about which there had been so much
on. Pamel. dissention, to keep to *Unity* the *Mother* and *Root* of the *Catholick*
42. Church ; and therefore to communicate with *Cornelius* who was
a *Catho-*

—Quando habeat omnis Episcopus pro licentiâ libertatis & potestatis suæ, arbitrium proprium ; tamque judicari ab alio non possit, quam nec ipse potest judicare. Sed expectemus universi Judicium Domini nostri Jesu Christi, qui unus & solus habet potestatem & præponendi nos in Ecclesiæ suæ gubernatione, & de actu nostro judicandi. Concil. Carthag. Episcoporum 87. A. D. 256. apud Cyprianum. p. 229. Edit. Oxon.

a *Catholick Bishop*, and not with the *Schismaticks* who did not keep to the *Unity of the Church*, for the persuading of whom to such *Unity* he had sent among them *Caldonius* and *Fortunatus*. A man would guess from your saying that *Cyprian* goes on, and advises the *Bishops of Numidia*, &c. that this *Epistle* had been writ to them, but this is but another touch of your skill, and reading the *Authors* you quote.

But now you are returned to *St. Peter* again, whom *Eusebius* pag. 12. (you say) calls *πρωτοπρεσβυτερος*, the *Prince or Prolocutor*, &c. which are betwixt you and me two very different things, that he appears every for his virtue or zeal's sake was their *Prolocutor*, I easily grant, but this does not prove him their *Prince or Supreme*, and you ought to remember that *honourary Titles* or *Compellations* are not to be rigidly taken, or stretched too far.

As to your large *Title and Testimony* from the *Epistle of Saint* pag. 12. *Athanasius* to *Marcus Bishop of Rome* (where again you have left *St. Peter*) upon which I suppose and that out of *St. Bernard* you ground your former Assertion that the *Bishops of Rome* are the *Conserver*s of the ancient *Decrees of General Councils*; I will be brief and tell you that it is a pitifull forged nonsensical piece of stuff, that you would here impose on us for the *Venerable St. Athanasius*. To wave *Dr. Cave*, and our own *Writers*, who make and prove it to be a forgery, your own great ^m *Bellarmino* and *Baronius* ^{m De Scri-} had the same opinion of it, the latter of whom, as you may ^{ptoribus} see in *Bellarmino* (*de Script. Eccl. in Gratiano*) hath quite ruined it. And here I cannot but admire that you should offer to ^{Eccles. in} put off such pitifull obsolete stuff in a Nation that hath so vast a ^{Athanasio.} number of learned men; and thereby to make your self ridiculous and contemptible, when such learned men as *Baronius* and *Bellarmino*, who had as much zeal as any for the *Chair at Rome*, and more learning than 400000—, had already baffled the forgery, and caused it to be hift off the stage. But such stuff it seems will down with you, and so doth that which is as bad, you may easily guess what it is I mean.

C H A P. XII.

*His Arguments from the Fourth Century for St. Peter's
Supremacy refuted.*

WHAT you wanted of evidence from the *three first Centu-
ries* of the Church, which are far from affording you any
Practice of such a Supremacy, or any hints of there being any such
thing settled at Rome, but all speak the direct contrary to it, as I
could very easily shew; you think to make up from little scraps
of Fathers of the fourth and fifth Centuries, whose Rhetorical and
honorary Expressions ought not to be taken in a strict literal sense,
because otherwise it were easie to make them contradict
themselves, nay altogether unavoidable to prevent it. The In-
stance shall be in St. Hilary whom you first quote. He tells us
pag. 12. (say you) Christ gave St. Peter the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven,

▪ Super hanc igitur Confessionis Pe-
tram Ecclesia edificatio est—
Hec Fides Ecclesia fundamentum est.
Hilarius de Trinit. l. 6.

and that he built his Church upon him: and yet in another part of his Works ^a this Fa-
ther makes the Confession it self (as most of
the Fathers doe) the Rock, on which our
Saviour built his Church. If you will

then take the words you quote in a strict sense, and I take those
that I quote in as strict and literal; St. Hilary I perceive is like
to suffer betwixt us, and be made directly to contradict himself.
As to the keys, that I'll answer anon. As we served St. Hilary,
so we must Epiphanius about the Rock, whom you quote ma-
pag. 13. king St. Peter, the first of the Apostles, the firm Rock upon which
God's Church was built. Him ^c I quote al-

• Καὶ ἦκουσιν, ὅτι ὅτι τῇ Πέτρῃ
ταύτῃ ἡ ἀσφαλὴς πέτρας ἐκδομένη
μετ' Ἑλληνοῦ. Epiphani. adv. He-
res. l. 2. Tom. 1. p. 500. Edit. Petav.

so making St. Peter's Confession (not his
person) the foundation of the Catholic
Church. I must confess that it is purely
necessity that forces me, or any of our

Church to shew these incoherences in the Fathers if taken in a ri-
gid literal sense, whereas allowing them a latitude befitting Homi-
les, not Controversies, Rhetorical Amplifications, not close inartificial
Discourses, they are consistent enough.

And

And so for St. Ambrose saying, Christ left St. Peter, as it were the Vicegerent or Deputy of his Love to us; in another place He pag. 13. makes this very Primacy, a Primacy of Confession, not of Honour, of Faith, not of Order; which expressions of his, together with the perfect silence of Scripture and Prime Antiquity as to the thing, make me I must confess neither *Profelyte* to subscribe to, nor an *Ad-* pag. 13. mirer of, what you quote from St. Hierome, that although God's Church was not so altogether founded upon St. Peter, but that the other Apostles also had a share with him in the Office [with your leave from your own Margin I translate, that all the Apostles were equal in the foundation, did equally receive the power of the keys, which expressions by the bye as they contradict your own Testimonies from St. Hilary and Epiphanius, so they ruine your pretensions for the Papal Supremacy of Jurisdiction] yet one is chosen amongst the Twelve, that a Head being placed over all, occasion of Schism might be taken away. I will but urge one place of Scripture, why I think I ought not to subscribe to it, and that is Acts 8. 14. Now when the Apostles which were at Jerusalem heard that Samaria had received [by the Ministry of Philip] the word of God, they sent unto them Peter and John; which had Peter been their Head [their Prince, their General, as others call him] would have looked just as well, and not a jot less, as if the College of Cardinals upon any important business into France should delegate and send the Pope and the Dean of their College thither.

* Statim loci non immemor sui primatum egit — primatum Confessionis unigue, non honoris, primatum Fidei non Ordinis. S. Ambros. de Incarnat. c. 4.

But to pass these Objections and to admit St. Hierome's asser- pag. 13. tion, it nor that from Optatus concerning the *Prima Cathedra* prove any thing more than a Primacy of Order, which our Church I believe will not deny to the Bishop of Rome; but that's not the thing will, or ever hath for these eight or nine hundred years contented them, they are for a Supremacy of Jurisdiction, as well as a Primacy of Order; their chief ground for which pretension is, as I take it, the investing St. Peter their Predecessour with the power of the keys, the thing I shall according to my promise undertake here the consideration of:

The dispute betwixt us about it is, not whether the keys were given to St. Peter, which no body of our Church did ever deny;

deny, but whether *he* received *them* in his *own person*, for his particular *use* and *trust* exclusively to all the rest of the *Apostles*. That *he* did not receive *them* in his *own person*, is plain from, and the *judgment* of, *Antiquity*; to you I need only urge your

^p—*Cuncti claves regni caelorum accipiant, & ex aquo super eos Ecclesia fortitudo solidetur. L. 1. adv. Jovin. c. 14.*

^q *Unus pro omnibus loquens, & Ecclesia voce respondens. S. Cyprian. Ep. 59. Edit. Oxon.*

^r *August. Ep. 165. Edit. Frob.*

own *Testimony* from St. ^p *Hierome* who makes the *Apostles* equally to receive the power of the keys, and to be equal in the foundation of the *Catholick Church*; for others sake I might urge St. *Cyprian* ^q, who makes St. *Peter* the mouth of them all, and to make that *Confession* (upon which the keys were bestowed) in the name of the *Church*. St. *Augustine* ^r who is of the same opinion, and others, but I had

rather recur to *Scripture* it self, where I think it is evident enough, that *he* did in the name, and for the use of them all receive those keys: This I prove from St. *Matthew*, who brings in our *Saviour* (within two Chapters from that ^s, wherein the discourse of our *Saviour* with his *Disciples*, and his gift of the keys to *Peter* is recorded) speaking to his *Disciples* as invested already

^c *Matth. 16. 13. 14, &c.*

^{*} *S. Matt. 18. 17, 18. And if he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the Church, but if he neglect to hear the Church, let him be to thee as an Heathen man and a Publicane; verily I say unto you, whatsoever ye shall bind on earth, shall be bound, &c. and whatsoever ye shall loose—shall be loosed in heaven.*

with this power of binding and loosing ^t: which place with me puts it past all doubt, that the rest of the *Apostles* were equally concerned in that speech of our *Saviour's* to St. *Peter*, and thereby had equal power. But if they will not allow this place to suppose a power already given, they will not dare to deny that it doth confer, so that if *he* had the power given

to him particularly in the *Sixteenth Chapter* of this Gospel, they all have it now in the *Eighteenth*, and thereby the same *Jurisdiction* and *Authority* in the *Church*; which quite destroys all you have been hitherto about, which was indeed to prove St. *Peter* had the same *Supremacy* invested on him by our *Saviour*, which the *Bishops* of *Rome* do since from him exercise and enjoy; But how little you have performed, I dare appeal to any indifferent person, to your own self, if you will but compare your papers and mine together: so that I might save my self the trouble to try what you say about that *Primacy* not dying

with

with Peter; but I will not, lest you should say, I left that part unanswered.

CHAP. XIII.

Arguments for the Primacy not dying with Peter answered, the Proofs out of St. Chrysostome for St. Peter's Supremacy fully confuted.

YOUR Arguments for the Primacy not dying with Peter are pag. 13. few and which is worse nothing to your purpose, since they are far from proving what you desire: but you ought to have remembred that it is not onely your Task to prove that there was such a Primacy, and that it was not to die with St. Peter, but that it was to descend to the successive Bishops of Rome after his decease, and not to any of the Apostles, nor to the Bishops of Antioch. But since I perceive we shall find the first, to wit of proving the Primacy not to die with St. Peter, too many for you, it would be cruel to put you upon proving any of the other: for as to that proof out of the Epistle of St. Hierome to Demetrias, all it proves is that Innocentius was Anastasius's Successour in the Apostolical Chair at Rome: now if you cannot prove hence, either that this pag. 14. was the sole and onely Apostolical Chair, or that it was always the chief and governing Chair of the Catholick Church, every one will see that you alledged a place nothing to the purpose, having not a word of St. Peter in it; that you cannot shew either of them, is what I, to prevent your trouble of inquiring among your people about it, will make appear in a very few words.

That the Apostolical Chair at Rome is not the onely Chair in the Church Catholick, Tertullian is demonstration; Run over (saith he) the Apostolical Churches, in which the very Chairs the Apostles used are to this day presided in by the Bishops in their several places: and then he reckons Corinth and Philippi, and Rome it self among the rest.

▼ Percurre Ecclesias Apostolicas, apud quas ipsæ adhuc Cathedræ Apostolorum suis locis præsentur. — proxima est tibi Achala, habes Corinthum — Philippus, — Thessalonicenses, — Ephesum — Roman. Tertull. de Præscript. contr. Hæres. c. 36. Edit. Junii Franckeri. 1597.

G

That

— * *Post servatoris Ascensum Petrus, Jacobum & Joannem, quamvis Dominus ipsos ceteris praeulisset, non ideo de primo honoris gradu inter se contendisse, sed Jacobum cognomine Justum, Hierosolymorum Episcopum elegisse. Clemens apud Euseb. Hist. Eccl. l. 2. c. 1. Edit. Vales.*

That it was not originally the chief or governing Chair is as plain from the account we have in Eusebius from * Clemens his Sixth Book of Institutions; That after our Lord's Ascension, Peter, James and John, tho' preferred [not Peter alone] by our Lord above the rest of the Apostles, did not thereupon contend among themselves for the first place of Honour, but chose James the Just Bishop

of Jerusalem. Whose Chair I am sure this passage makes Primus Honoris Gradus, the chief Cathedra in the world.

pag. 14. Having thus spoiled this your proof, your next will give me the less trouble, wherein St. Hierome tells Damasus, that in this miserable condition of the Eastern Churches being over-run by Heresies, he would stick to St. Peter's Chair and that Faith commended by St. Paul, &c. which passage would have cleared it self, had you but been so just as to have translated the very next words, which bring us St. Hierome's reason for this his resolution of slighting all Hereticks, and communicating with the Apostolical

— * *Inde nunc mea anima postulans cibum, unde olim Christi vestimenta suscepi. Hieron. Ep. Damasio.*

Chair at Rome, because he had in that Church been first made a Christian, and therefore thence would receive the spiritual food for his Soul. Had you Mr. Sch. but made

St. Hierome's resolution your own, you had never fallen from the Catholick, Apostolical and Orthodox Communion of the Church of England unto that of ——. In the mean time remember that you have not proved either a Primacy, or a Succession in it for the Bishops of Rome.

In the next place, as tho' conscious to your self that you had done nothing hitherto, and that your Arguments for the Supremacy and then for the Succession were too weak, you fall again to the proving that St. Peter was Supreme, O incomparable Method! and are now resolved to doe it to purpose. But how? out of St. Chrysostome's Homilies and Comments; There is no one that hath looked, tho' but a little, into that Father, that will not smile at this your attempt. However you tell us, and no body will deny it, that he gives St. Peter extraordinary and noble Titles, that he calls him, Prime Leader of the Apostles, the head of Orthodoxy, the great High-Priest of the Church — the Pillar of the Church

pag. 15.

Church—the Head of the Chorus of the Apostles, and says that He took the charge of the whole Church throughout the World, &c.

I have onely this question to put to you, whether you take St. Chrysostome, as to these passages concerning St. Peter (the greatest as well as the clearest of which for your purpose I have here set down) in a strict literal sense? if you own it; as you seem to do by placing them here for such a purpose, I must then plainly tell you, that you doe a very great wrong to this Holy and learned Father, than whom no one perchance ever gave himself a greater liberty as to Rhetorical flights in his Homilies: since in other places he bestows Titles as high and as great as these on other Apostles, which if I take in the same sense that you do these, the Good Father is made inconsistent with himself, and to preach down-right falsities and contradictions. I'll instance onely in St. John and St. Paul; do but give your self the trouble to read over his Preface to his Comments on St. John's Gospel, and tell me then, whether you do not find him among other large Elogies calling St. John the Pillar of all the Churches throughout the world, and telling us that He had the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven.

But for St. Paul, I am confident I can make even you confess that He mounts him above St. Peter himself, concerning whom you have furnished a Catalogue of such glorious Titles. Look but upon his Comment on that ^a saying of St. Paul's [2 Cor. 11. 28.] about his care of all the Churches (a passage by the bye that is more, than all your whole Church can patch together for St. Peter,) how he advances our Apostle; there he tells us, that St. Paul had the care and charge not of a single House, but of Cities, and Countreys, and Nations, yea of the whole world ^b: in another place that he was intrusted with the charge and Government of the whole world, which is the very same Commission and as full and clear as that great one (which is your chief and best) that you quote for St. Peter of his having the charge of the Church throughout the world. And he does not onely make St. Paul

equal in dignity to St. Peter, but which is much more

— ὁ κύριος τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν.
Εκκλησιῶν.— ὁ τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν κύριος.
ἱεροσύνη. Tom. 2. p. 555. ad fin. Edit.
Savil.

• Οὐτως ὁ ἐκ οἰκίας μᾶς, ἀλλὰ καὶ πολλῶν καὶ δήμων καὶ ἐθνῶν καὶ βασιλείων ὁ οἰκονόμος φερύπτερος ἔστιν. Chryl.
Tom. 3. p. 679.

ḃ — τὴν τῆς οἰκουμένης πρεσβυτερίαν ἡγεμενικῶς. Orat. 5. contr. Jud.
Tom. 6. pag. 354.

* Οὐδὲν ἢ ἐκεῖνον μείζον, ἀλλ' ἔστι ἰσὺς ἰσῶν. D. Chryl. Orat. 9. Tom. 6. p. 97. Edit. Savil.

advances him above him, as I undertook to prove. * No one (says he speaking of St. Paul) is greater than he, no nor equal to him neither, &c.

By this time I hope I have made it evident, that St. Chrysostome will not doe your business, that he is as much, nay more against you, than for you; and that you and I ought both of us to own our several

* Ἀρχιερεῖς γὰρ εἰσιν ὑπὸ Θεοῦ χειροτονούμενοι οἱ Ἀπόστολοι, ἀρχόντες ἕκ ἑσθ' ἐκ πόλεως διαφόρων λαμβάνοντες, ἀλλὰ πάντες κοινῇ τὴν Οἰκουμένην Ἐμπιστευόμενοι. D. Chryl. Tom. 8. p. 115. Edit. Savil.

Quotations for Rhetorical Flights, since in another^d place, if you and I be obstinate against any allowances for these passages; He spoils all we have both brought, when he tells us, That the Apostles were appointed by God to be Rulers, not [Temporal] Rulers, to receive each his Nation or City, but [Spiritual. Rulers] intrusted in

Common All together with the Care of [the Catholick Church throughout] the World. Therefore as all your Authorities from

pag. 15. St. Chrysostome for St. Peter's Supremacy are out of doors, so that from St. Augustine comes too late having the same fault, as I could most easily shew, but do not think I need to trouble my self with it, or what the Popes Legates said at Chalcedon, that being to make a Man his own witness. Especially since that great Council had so little value for what they said that they did

* Etenim antiqua Romæ Throno QUOD URBS ILLA IMPERARET jure Patres Privilegia tribuere, & EADEM CONSIDERATIONE moti 150 Dei amantissimi Episcopi S. Sancto novæ Romæ Throno ÆQUALIA PRIVILEGIA addixerunt, &c. Concil. Chalced. cap. 28. Edit. Bever. Oxon.

(notwithstanding all the Pope's opposition) decree that Constantinople should enjoy equal Privileges with old Rome, and which is more did declare, * that as well old as new Rome had such great Privileges bestowed upon them, purely because they were successively the Imperial Cities of the world.

C H A P. XIV.

The ridiculous Use of his Testimonies shewn, and his foolish Aspersions upon the Church of England wiped off.

THese Testimonies, say you, I content my self withall, as sufficient to shew, I have not gone rashly on without the advice of pag. 15. ancient Councillors, &c. It had been one further happiness for your Testimonies could they but have contented others as well, as you say they have done you; but how can that be expected, since they are (as I think I have fully shewn) far from being satisfactory, because altogether insufficient for the design you gather'd them for. In a word, you have neither proved that Christ left his Church in a Monarchical State, nor that St. Peter was made the sole Head and Dictator (as you word it) of the Catholick Church, nor lastly that the Bishops of Rome have, and do succeed him in such a charge. Had you done these, you had done your cause service: to attempt and not to do it, is but to tell the World that it cannot be done; and what thanks you will have for that, I can very easily guess.

All these Testimonies you sum up with St. Bernard, but since pag. 15. be lived far too late to be admitted a Witness about these things, and you might as well have quoted those two Monsters of Men Gregory the Seventh and Innocent the Third for those purposes; I must set him aside.

No Body ought to wonder that you are pleased with what you have thus scraped together, or that you think you have found something, since every one likes his own best; how little reason you had to flatter your self, I think I have abundantly proved; but on you go, and now strongly imagine that the wise God and his Son — could leave (which is a little too bold with God, did leave, might surely serve you) none other at his As- pag. 16. cension, &c. To be short, Sir, all this pleasant fancy is answered already, and all you have so carefully been about hitherto, proves but a Dream, a Delusion proceeding from your examining things by false Measures, and through a false Glass. But for all
this,

this, *This must be the Church you called Catholick in your Creed, and till now, did not so well mind, &c.* Alas, Sir, that a Man of your parts and years should not before this have minded what *Catholick* meant, and where that *Church* was, when there's scarce a person of any tolerable sense in *England*, that cannot with a great deal of readines give a sufficient account of *these things*: but here is the *Mystery*, you have found that the *Church of Rome* is this *very Church* mentioned in our common *Creed*, and that when we profess we believe the *Holy Catholick Church*, we mean tho' we do not mind it, the *Church of Rome*.

pag. 17. It is to no purpose to endeavour to reclaim such Men as you, since you seem to have abandoned the common principles by which Mankind govern themselves, for else how could you dream of a part being the whole; a Member, the Body. That the *Church of Rome* was from the beginning reckoned a particular *Church*, I think is as plain as that *Rome* is in *Italy*; I have proved it so fully above, that I almost loath such a ridiculous subject of discourse. And your Authorities from *Pacian* and *Cyril of Jerusalem* are not one jot to your purpose, if you intend them to confirm that the *Church of Rome* is the *Catholick Church*; all that they say or prove being that *Catholick* is the Sirname of true *Christians*, and that every one should enquire for, and unite with the *Catholick Church* into whatsoever place he comes. Now what is this to the *Church of Rome*, here is no mention of her here, not a syllable to determine that she is the *Catholick Church*, to unite with which these two Fathers are carefull to advise.

These things, you tell us, gave you some small encouragement to betake your self to that Communion, that was both *Christian* and *Catholick*, &c. for which very reason you needed not have left the Communion of the *Church of England*, which is both *Christian* and *Catholick*.

You ought to dislike *Papist* upon the same ground you dislike *Protestant*, and if *Christian* was too large for you, you needed not to leave the *Church of England* to be both *Catholick* and *Christian*: the *Church of England* denominates her self from no particular Persons good or bad, but is a *True Church* having lawfull Pastors and a *Catholick Faith*.

You next say you cannot imagine why Protestants should so decline the Title (of Catholick you mean) or suffer it with so much silence to be laid aside, unless it be, because it imports a Faith spread throughout the World, which they very well know, would be utterly impossible to prove their Protestant Faith ever was, &c. Whether this passage is more ridiculous or false, I must own that upon the sudden I cannot tell; if you mean here as you ought the Church of England, (as you must to be consistent with your self, having a good while ago cast off all the other Reformed Communions) nothing can be more false and ridiculous, since twice a Day we use it constantly in our Service, and surely you will not be so extravagantly unreasonable to say we do not Mean or Pray for our selves, when we Pray for the Good Estate of the Catholick Church: So that our declining the Title, and suffering it with so much silence to be laid aside, must be put to the account of the grosser sort of Untruths.

And we need not wonder that you would offer a false reason for a false thing; our Faith and the Faith of all the Reformed Churches having been already proved to be Catholick; and therefore your utterly impossible to prove it to be a Faith spread throughout the World, must be put up on the same account.

Nor is there ever a Member of the Church of England of any Learning that I ever met with, or heard of, that either declined the Title of a [Reformed] Catholick, or was not ready onely to profess, but also to prove that by being a Son of the Church of England he was a Member of a Catholick Church.

As to what you add about the other Adjunct in our (ours I say of the Church of England, as well as yours at Rome) Creed, Apostolical, that you saw less reason for their claim to that, and to give them their due, they were more modest than much to insist upon it, &c. This Sentence is Brass every bit of it; for if you mean the Church of England here, I am astonished to think you should have so little Conscience, or so little Modesty to publish such a gross untruth in the face of a Church, that is so far from not insisting on the Title of Apostolical, that it denounces every person excommunicate that shall dare to say the

§ Whoſoever ſhall hereafter affirm that the Church of England by Law eſtabliſhed under the Kings Maſteſty is not a TRUE and an APOſTO-LICAL CHURCH, teaching and maintaining the DOCTRINE of the APOſTLES, let him be Excommunicated ipſo facto, and not reſtored, but only by the Arch-Biſhop, after his Repentance and publick Re-vocation of this his WICKED ERROUR. Can. 3. of the Synod in 1603.

Faith and Succeſſion. If you include alſo the reſt of the Reformed Churches, you might eaſily know, that there is no thing they ſo much inſiſt upon as the proving their *Faith and Practices* to be purely *Apoſtolical*, and therefore their Churches to be ſuch; ſo that neither are they ſo *modest* as not to inſiſt on their being *Apoſtolical*; as to the want of *Succeſſion* among them that you object againſt *em*, and they do not deny; you your ſelf have furniſhed them with an answer to your Party from St. Ambroſe's words, that they enjoy not the inheritance [or *Succeſſion*] of Peter, who have not the *Faith* of Peter.

Non habent Petri hereditatem, qui Petri Fidem non habent. de Pœnit. l. 1. c. 5.

pag. 19. But here you have a mind to make the Church of England to be of your opinion, that is, that the foreign Reformed Churches have no true *Ministers*, becauſe thoſe that come out of France with the Title of *Ministers*, are not allowed to exerciſe their *Ministry*, before they receive the Orders of the Church of England, &c. It is true, they are not allowed to have a Cure of Souls here without the taking of *Episcopal Orders*, becauſe it is expreſſly provided by Act of Parliament among us, that no one ſhall have ſuch a Cure of Souls without *Episcopal Orders*, which Act you know was fully deſigned againſt our home *Dissenters*, who had opportunities of *Episcopal Orders* at home; not againſt them, who could not have them at home, with whom alſo we had nothing to do: But ſince no exception was made in the Act for them, the Church cannot diſpenſe with an Act of Parliament in their favour: However that ſhe allows theirs to be true tho' imperfect Churches,

Churches, is hence plain, because *her* Members in *their* Travels communicate with *those* Churches; which thing *she* would never permit, had *they* no Ministry; it was the Practice of our Exiles in France during the long Rebellion; and Dr. R. Watson hath lately put forth the most Learned and most Religious Bishop Cozin (who was one of those noble exiled Confessors) his Defence of their communicating there with Geneva rather than Rome. So that your Argument fails you also here.

C H A P. XV.

More of his foul Aspersions on the Church of England exposed and confuted.

YOU are next resolved to have a little fling at the Church of England about her Orders, which you say, they [of that Church] very much endeavour to prove, and vain would have confest to be [received from] undoubted Bishops of the Church of Rome: But here your heart failed you, and this is all you have to say against our Orders, which is nothing at all, since we are much abler, and as ready to prove the Legitimacy of our Orders, as you can those of your Pope himself: this is to bark, when you dare not come near to fasten, but if you have a mind to shew your parts upon this subject, do but undertake and answer Arch-Bishop Bramhall's Confutation of the Nags-head Ordination, &c. and I'll do, as I hear you have, renounce my Orders. But Alas Sir I might as well put you upon carrying Westminster Abby to Putney, as upon the Answering that Unanswerable Book.

After the civil hint that the Church of England hath no true Orders, you are for making her amends, out of Reverence to her, by proving that she is a very Nonsensical foolish Church, which you attempt by two small (you have a kindness still for her, or else we might have had four, perhaps ten great) Observations.

Your first is, That this reduces the Catholic Church into a narrow corner of the World——*Toto divisos orbe Britannos*, and as pag. 19. small a handfull in that narrow Corner, &c.

H

But



But pray Mr. *Sclater* how are we got hither ? What is this, *This*, that reduces the *Catholick Church*, &c. Hath the *Church* of *England* denied the foreign *Reformed Churches* to be true *Churches* ? Pray shew us where ? But suppose she had, this will not prove that the *Catholick Church* is reduced into this narrow Corner of the World, except you shew, that she hath also denied the *Church of Rome*, and those *Churches* that submit to her to be true *Churches*. Nor this neither will not confirm your *Observation*, supposing the *Church of England* had rejected both the foreign *Reformed*, and *Unreformed Churches* out of the *Catholick Church* ; since you have surely heard of such a *Church*, as the *Large Greek Church* under the *Four Patriarchs*, of the *Russian Church*, of the vast *Aethiopian Church*, of the *Armenian*, and of the *Nestorians* to omit others. Have you or can you prove that the *Church of England* hath excluded all these also from being *Parts* or *Members* of the *Catholick Church* ? If you cannot, how doth she confine the *Catholick Church* here, or what contradiction is she guilty of, that abhors the thought of such a thing as you would fasten upon her.

I cannot refrain shewing a just resentment here, and therefore must tell you, that this your *Observation* is the most disingenuous, and the most foolish that I ever met with in my Life, and that I could never have suspected that any *Man* that had common sense, and pretended to *Conscience*, could have been guilty of so foul a thing, had I not met with it in this *Book*.

And just such stuff as this is the *Remark* in this *Observation*, upon our *Church*, that she is pleased in order to avoid the Word *Catholick*, to call it an *Universal Church*, &c. Who would expect that a *Man* that hath been a *Minister* in our *Church* these *Thirty Years*, that hath used our *Service* perchance a *Thousand times*, should make such a strange *Remark* ; hath our *Church* (as you say she hath) in order to avoid the Word *Catholick*, struck it out of that *Translation* of the *Apostles Creed*, which she appoints in her *Liturgy* ? Hath she struck it out, and put in *Universal* in the *Four places* it used to occur in in the *Creed* of *St. Athanasius* ? Is it gone out of the *Nicene Creed* she appoints ? Pray get some *Body* to look those *Three Creeds* for you. A *Man* would believe

lieve you had not seen a *Common-Prayer-Book* these *Thirty Years*, or pass a much severer Sentence upon you. Doth not the Church of England command its *Daily Use* in the *General Collect*, which we daily put up for the good Estate of the *Catholick Church*? And further she is so far from altering or endeavouring to avoid, as you most falsely would observe she doth, the Word *Catholick*, that whereas in the *Injunctions* of King *Edward the Sixth*, 1547. See Bishop Sparrows Collection of Canons, &c. the Form of bidding the *Common-Prayers* [before Sermon] begun thus; You shall Pray for the whole Congregation of *Christ's Church*, of Canons, and, &c. in those of *Queen Elizabeth*, 1559, and in the 55th &c. of the *Canons Ecclesiastical* of the *Synod* under King *James the First*, 1604. the Word *Catholick* is put in, and every Minister is commanded to begin his bidding of Prayer in these very words, Ye shall Pray for *Christ's Holy Catholick Church*, &c. Nay you your self used the term *Catholick* (while you continued, and as a Member of our Church) on last *Palm-Sunday* at *Putney Church*, or else you broke our Church Laws: So that I cannot now avoid the asking you your self what you now think of this your Remark, and whether you had not saved your self a disparagement, had you had the good fortune not to have put it down.

You have a *Second Remark* much akin to the *First*, in which you profess you can no more tell [how she can be the *Catholick Church*] than she is able to find her self in the innumerable huddle of ten times Ten more *Dissenters*, *Dissemblers*, and *Indifferents*, than her number is able to make, &c. pag. 19. How you come to know the number of those that hold *Communion* with the Church of England to be so very small, is matter of wonder to me; but if I should say that your Calculation is most intolerably false, I am sure you cannot disprove me, since I am certain I have truth and the common judgment of all unprejudiced Men on my side, that Calculating the numbers of the several *Parishes* thro' England, there are one with another Ten (I may I believe safely say Twenty) times more that hold *Communion* with the Church of England than dissent from it: As for *Dissemblers* and *Indifferents* how you come to know Mens Hearts so well is owing more to your new than old Religion, which would have taught you more Prudence about such things.

2 Obs.
pag. 20.

After you have come off so wretchedly with your first Observation, no Body will expect wonders from your second, which is, *That you should have had the better Opinion of this handfull (as you ridiculously call the Church of England) if their Faith had been conformable to the Faith of those Bishops from whom their Bishops had their Mission, &c.*

That our Bishops have their Mission from Rome, is what we utterly deny, that *they* were, some of 'em, in the beginning of the most necessary Reformation ordained by *those* that held with the Church of Rome in her corrupt Faith and Practices is what we do not deny. This however we say cannot prejudice our Reformation, since if there were Errors fit to be thrown out of our Church, *you your self* (I am sure *your Learned Men*) will grant that no Ordination can prejudice or hinder such a Rejection of Errors. That there were such Errors crept in which ought to be cast out, and were at our Reformation, is what our Church-Men a Hundred times over have invincibly proved.

pag. 20.

As to the Rule you bring from St. Ambrose that *they* enjoy not the Inheritance of Peter, *who* receive not the Faith of Peter, we are very ready to join issue with *you*, or any of *your Church* upon it, and I question not before *you* and I part on this subject, to ruine the Papal and Roman Succession by your own Rule, to wit, by proving that *they* have receded from the Faith of Peter and the whole Primitive Church.

pag. 20.

We readily own that a true and Apostolical Mission, Commission and Ordination are considerable particulars, and are as ready any time to assert that our Church hath them, and to prove it against *you* at any time, if *you* have a mind to undertake this point against her.

CHAP. XVI.

The Doctrine of the Church of England concerning the Eucharist put down. Mr. Sci.'s Reasons from Scripture for Transubstantiation answered.

HAVING traced you hitherto, and found all your Attempts vain, and your Reasons to no purpose, which you took so much pains to scrape together, to have proved that our Saviour Christ left his Catholick Church in a Monarchical State under a Particular Vicegerent, and that that Vicegerent was the Bishop of Rome, and his Church the Catholick Church. And having shewn all your Attacks against, and Remarks upon the Church of England to be very vain, extremely abusive, and extravagantly ridiculous; I have now onely your last, your great Reason to examine, wherein you make an effort to prove, that her Faith concerning the Eucharist is contrary to that of the Catholick Church.

If you could have proved this, I must confess your forsaking our Communion would have been much more reasonable: and therefore I question not, but that as you have mustered up abundance of Authorities, so you have done all you can to make them speak and declare against us: but to how little purpose you have made all this noise and ado about this point also is what I shall quickly see.

Before I enter on your particular proofs, I have a fresh complaint to make, that you have not used herein that Ingenuity, that would have become a Scholar; one might very rationally have expected that as your Intentions were to prove against the Church of England, that her Faith was as to the Eucharist false and corrupt, so you would have set down what that her Faith is. This would have looked like fair and ingenuous dealing, first to have put down her Faith about the Eucharist, and then to have shewn, how contrary it was to Scripture, and to the unanimous Consent of Antiquity. If you reply to this my Complaint, that her Faith is so well known that you needed not put it down together, but that you have occasionally done it up and down these Authorities;

thorities; I must tell you that by the account you give of it occasionally, one would be persuaded that it is far from being so well known: I am sure that *slender accounts*, or rather *hints* that you so often intersperse about it, are *utterly false* and *very foolish*: so that if any one should take an account of *our Churches Faith* from you, and whom can they better take it from than one that was so lately a *Minister* among us, they must believe that we hold the *Eucharist* to be *mere figures*, *mere representations*, and *bare signs*; for that is the most you allow us to make of it that I can meet with in *your Book*; all which how far it is from Truth I shall quickly shew you.

Well then, since you had not the Ingenuity to put down an Account of the *Church of England's Faith* about the *Eucharist*, I must, that so I may the better examine the *Proofs* you bring, and any one may compare the *Authorities* you quote, and *our Faith* together, and thereby more impartially judge, and more readily discover, whether *Antiquity* fairly laid down speak for, or against us.

Concerning this Sacrament the *Church of England* in her 28th Article of Religion delivers her Opinion thus, *The Supper of the Lord is not onely a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves one to another; but rather it is a Sacrament of our Redemption by Christ's death. Inasmuch that to such as rightly, worthily, and with Faith receive the same, the Bread which we break is a partaking of the Body of Christ, and likewise the Cup of Blessing is a partaking of the Blood of Christ. After which having declared her self against Transubstantiation as repugnant to plain Scripture, and to the nature of a Sacrament, and [against any Corporal Presence of Christ's Natural Flesh and Blood in the Declaration about kneeling at the end of our Communion-Service in our Liturgy,] she goes on in this Article to declare that The Body of Christ is given, taken and eaten in the Supper, onely after an heavenly and spiritual manner: and that the Mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper, is Faith; which last expressions exclude the wicked from partaking of Christ's Body, and allow them barely the Sign, or outward part of the Eucharist.*

In the *Publick Catechism* in the *Liturgy*, having taught her *Catechumens* that there are two things in each of the *Sacraments*, the

the outward Sign, and the inward spiritual Grace, she teaches them to answer that the outward part of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper is Bread and Wine, and that the inward part or thing signified, is the Body and Bloud of Christ, which are verily and indeed taken and received by the Faithfull in the Lord's Supper.

These passages are sufficient to shew that our Church holds a real, but not carnal, a Spiritual and Heavenly but not Corporal, Participation of Christ's Body and Bloud, which tho' locally and naturally in Heaven, is yet after a Mystical and Supernatural way communicated to the Faithfull not by the mouth of the Body, but by that of Faith.

Thus much for her Sentiment concerning this Sacrament, now pag. 20. I must try your Reasons against it. You tell us that you had been a long time greatly concerned for the Interpretation of but five small words of our Saviour, &c. The result of your concern I suppose was that those five words (I doubt we shall find more than five, or double five concerned in this business) are to be taken in a literal sense; and that which you offer for proof of it is this. First, Because this Sacrament was his last Will and Testament, which ought not to be worded obscurely or doubtfully to prevent quarrels and divisions. Secondly, Because this Will is repeated by so many of his Apostles without the least variation or caution against the literal sense. Thirdly, Because it was an Oath or Sacrament, a Testament, a Precept, an Article of Faith, or a Position to continue in the Church for ever, the true Interpretation whereof, if Catholick Tradition have not given us, it is likely it will never be agreed on.

These are the strength of what you say, to the first of which I answer that this Will was neither worded obscurely, or of doubtful interpretation; that there are Divisions about them is not owing to the words, but to the perverse humours of some Men, whose quarrels no plainness is able to prevent. To your second I say, that it is utterly false that our Saviour's Will, or the Institution of this Sacrament was repeated by so many of his Apostles (allowing Mark and Luke the name of Apostles, tho' you know it is very unusual) without the least variation: to convince you of which, do but look upon this Parallel Account that I here send you out of them, and then consider what reason you had, or with what face you could affirm as you do.

St. Matth.

St. *Matth.* c. 26. 26, &c.

— And said, take eat, *This is my Body*, — drink you all of this, for *This is my Bloud of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the Remission of Sins.*

St. *Luke* 22. 19, &c.

— saying, *This is my Body, which is given for you: this doe in remembrance of me:* — saying, *This Cup is the New Testament in my Bloud, which is shed for you.*

St. *Mark* 14. 22, &c.

— And said, take eat, *This is my Body*, — and they all drank of it, and he said unto them, *This is my Bloud of the New Testament, which is shed for many.*

St. *Paul*, 1 *Cor.* 11. 23, &c.

— and said, take, eat, *This is my Body, which is broken for you, this doe in remembrance of me.* — saying, *This Cup is the New Testament in my Bloud, This doe ye, as oft as you drink it in remembrance of me.*

For the other part of your *second Argument*, that the *Apostles* put down no caution against the *literal sense*, the reason is evident enough, because there was no need of it, since the *Words* neither then, nor now can be taken in a *literal sense*, as I shall quickly shew you; and since nothing was more common to the *Jewish Mode* of speaking, than to give the name of the thing it self to that which is the *sign* of it: As is most plain from the *Paschal Lamb* its being so ² often in both *Testaments* called the *Passover*, whereof all know it was but the *sign*; from ³ *Circumcision* its being called the *Covenant*,

▪ Deuter. 16. 2, 5, 6.
Matth. 26. 17. Luke 22. 7, 11.
7 Gen. 17. 13.

when it was but the *sign* of it: nay nothing is more common among us, than to say such an one lives at the *Lion*, the *Bear*, the *Ship*, the *Bible*, which yet any one, that talks with us, knows that we mean barely the *signs* of them, without any *Caution* given, or requisite against taking us in a *literal sense*.

3. Your *third Argument* I do not well understand, since an *Oath*, a *Precept*, an *Article of Faith*, and a *Position* are very odd terms to express this *Sacrament* by: and it is the first time I ever

ever heard is called, or knew it to be an Article of Faith, having ever before thought it to be a divine Rite or Practice that was by Christ's Command to continue ever in the Church: but to pass over such trifles; We do affirm, that Catholick Tradition hath given us the true Interpretation of these words, which is, that they are to be taken in a Figurative sense, and that by Body here is meant ^a *Figura*, as Tertullian, *Signum*, as St. ^b *Augustine*, and many more acquaint us, as we shall by and by prove. In the mean time I must prove that these words, *This is my Body*, cannot be taken in a literal sense; which our Enemies themselves of your Party will grant me, if I prove that the THIS mentioned here is Bread.

That it was is thus cleared, That which our Saviour took into his hands (when he was about the Institution) was Bread; that which he blessed was the same thing that he had taken into his hands; that which he brake was the same thing that he had blessed; that which he gave them when he said it was his Body, was that which he had broken; But that which he broke, which he blessed, which he took into his hands was Bread: therefore it was Bread, which he gave his Disciples, and by THIS is meant *This Bread*.

This Induction is so fair and so clear, that I am sure you cannot evade it: but farther,

If by the *This* here is not meant the Bread, pray let us know what it was then exclusive to Bread, and which is more; how the Bread could be by the words, *This is my Body*, converted into the Body of Christ, if the Bread was not mentioned here, nor meant by the word *This*.

This matter and Argument is so demonstrative, that I cannot but stand amazed that men who pretend to Reason can refuse it; I could urge this Argument much farther, but will content my self with these few Remarks. First, That tho' our Saviour did not say plainly, *This Bread is my Body*, yet he said according to St. Luke and St. Paul, *This CUP is the New Testament in my Blood*; which passage doth fully determine, that the Bread was as much meant in the *This is my Body*, as the Cup was in the

^a — hoc est Corpus meum dicendo, id est Figura Corporis mei. Tertull. c. Marc. l. 4. c. 40.

^b Non dubitavit dicere, Hoc est Corpus meum, cum Signum daret Corporis sui. D. August. contr. Adamant. c. 12. Edit. Basil. 1569.

Luke 22.
20.
1 Cor. 11.
26.

Matth. 26. *This is my Blood*, in St. Matthew and St. Mark. Secondly, That
 18. our Saviour himself calls the *Wine* after he had consecrated it,
 Mark 14. *the Fruit of the Vine*, Matth. 26. 29. and St. Paul does not less
 24. than three times call the *Bread* after Consecration, *Bread*; which
 1 Cor. 11. places are evidence enough, that our Saviour neither destroyed
 26, 27, 28. the *Substances* of the *Elements*, nor that St. Paul, or any of the
Faithfull ever believed that he had.

Places I could bring enough out of the *Fathers* to confirm
 that by *This* they understood *this Bread*, but must not to avoid
 being tedious, one however out of your *Fathers* I cannot omit,
 which as it proves what I say, so it does prove you to be not
 onely a very excellent *Translatour*, but a very honest sincere *Man*.
 It is from your *Rupertus Abbas Tuitiensis* (who lived in the twelfth
 Century) whose words are these as you cite them, *Hoc [inquit]*
 id est hic Panis est Corpus meum, five Caro mea, which words you
 thus translate, *This (saith he) is that, This is my Body, this is my*
 Fig. 81. *Flesh*. A Translation so abominably false, and so intolerably ridicu-
 lous, that when I was at School, I would have disdained to
 have been guilty of such pitifull stuff: look at it again Mr. Scla-
 ter, fetch down your *Dictionary*, and try again at it, and see
 whether you that translate but at this rate, be fit to set up for
 a *Book-writer*, and a *Manager* of *Controversies*, and a *Balancer* of
 the *Merits* of the two Churches. I am ashamed that any *Man*
 that was ever of either of our *Universities*, or in *Holy Orders* in
 our Church should either have so little brains or so little hone-
 sty: but to let your Translation alone, *Rupertus* does confirm
 my reason for the determining *This* to mean *This Bread*, when he
 says, *This [saith our Saviour] that is, This Bread is my Body or*
my Flesh.

C H A P. XVII.

*His false Slander of our Church, and his foolish Observation
about Judas shewn.*

I Must next consider what you have of Argument in your Preface, where you would have us believe that the sixth Chapter of St. John's Gospel is to be taken in a literal sense; but since you were not at leisure to offer any Proof for it, I need spend no time to answer: one thing I must examine there, and that is the danger you said you must live and die in, under the denial, or but doubting of so great a Truth, in Communion with those that said, *How can this Man give us his Flesh to eat?* And doth our Church say so, that our Saviour cannot give us his Flesh to eat? How is it then, that in the Prayer [We do not presume, &c. she orders her Communicants to pray to our Gracious Lord to grant to them, so to eat the Flesh of his dear Son Jesus Christ, and to drink his Blood, that their sinfull Bodies may be made clean by his Body, and their Souls washed through his most pretious Blood, &c. That in the Prayer of Consecration the same Petition is put up, to omit any more places?

This, Sir, is very provoking, and highly unjust, that a Man, who hath perchance a hundred times used these very Prayers, who did last Palm-Sunday use them, read them when he administred the Eucharist to the Parishioners of Putney, should in the face of the Sun, in our own Nation, in our own Language publish so gross an Untruth, and affix so false a Scandal upon our Church as to say, she affirms our Saviour cannot give us his Flesh to eat. If these and such be the Fruits of your Conversion, sit anima mea cum Philosophis rather than with such Christians.

Do not think to bring off your self with saying that our Church denies that any one can eat the Flesh of Christ in that sense which those people meant it that spoke these words: that will not doe your business, since that Church whereof you now are, for all its belief of Transubstantiation, abhors the Caperna-

tical sense of these words as much as *we*, and are ready to say with *us* that *our Saviour cannot*, and does not give *us his Flesh* to eat in that carnal, sensual, abominable manner that these Capernaïtes talked of.

Matth. 26.
23, 25.

Your next Observation in your Preface that Judas was one of the Disciples that went back and walked no more with our Saviour, is I must confess a rarity, which hath escaped, I believe, all our Commentatours: but will your pretty (and spitefull) Observation hold? how is it then that we meet with Judas in our Saviour's dish the very night before he was Crucified? I know no other fetch that you can have to save your ingenious Observation besides that of a Gentleman, who in a dispute holding that Abraham was justified by Faith, and being pressed by the Opponent with that of St. James that Abraham was justified by Works, saved his bacon by saying that there were perhaps two Abrahams: and so you may gravely say, that there were two Judas Iscariots.

C H A P. XVIII.

His Authorities from Galatinus, and the Spurious Liturgies for Transubstantiation rejected, and the reason of it. His railing and Absurdities about these and other Spurious Pieces examined and exposed.

Preface

NOW we are come to your main Battel, where, like as the Turks are said to have had a sort of Souldiers called, as I remember, *Asaphi*, whom they set in the front of their Battel to dull and enervate their enemies by their cutting down of these dull Souls, so you have placed *Galatinus* and his Rabbins in your front to hinder your Adversaries falling with too much stomach upon your main Body. You saw it necessary however in your Preface to bespeak your Reader in favour of *Galatinus*, that he was always accounted a very learned Man. You had done well to have quoted some people on your side here, because your bare word will not pass with me, nor with any one else, that will take the pains to read our two papers; I am

I am sure he shewed neither Learning nor Honesty in these passages you quote from him, since he stole them from Porchetus Salvaticus without owning in the least whence he had them: and for the Passages and Rabbins themselves, it is the Opinion of Learned Men, that there were neither such Rabbins, nor such Works of theirs as to these things, but that they are the Pious Frauds of Porchetus and others: So that I need not trouble my self, but set aside this forged stuff; your calling them Prophetick, and abusing the place of St. John of the Spirits blowing where it listeth, &c. would in any other sort of People have been called Enthusiasm, and downright Fanaticism. See Dr. Cave's Charo-phylax in Galatino. p. 336.

And truly you put in as fair for a touch of the latter as your veriest Enemy could desire, when instead of Argument you vent your Anger, and instead of reasoning fall into downright railing against the Impious Ambition, and unlimited appetite of rule of the Private Spirit, which would fain soar above the Heavens, and make it self Lord even of the Writings of God also. Her private Glosses, imperious Sentiments, and contradictory Interpretations, like the Victorious Rabble of the Fishermen of Naples, riding in Triumph, and trampling under their feet Ecclesiastical Traditions, Decrees, and Constitutions, Ancient Fathers, Ancient Liturgies, the whole Church of Christ, &c.

But pray, Sir, if your Catholick fit be over, who is it that hath or own this Private Spirit you have been venting so much Spleen against? If you designed it for a Character of the Church of England, which I believe you did; I am obliged to tell you that it is a most impudent, and a most false Slander. Do but look into that Canon of our Church, which you your self quoted, and those little Remarks I made upon it, do but peruse again, what I said above, as to our Church tying up, and obliging all her Members by her Articles without leaving any of those things to a Private Spirit: and then look at what your bitter Pen hath here vented; if it do not make you eat up these Cholerick Nonsensical Words, and recant this Scandal upon an Apostolical Catholick Church, I must then tell you that you left common Honesty, and the Church of England at the same time.

See the Canon it self, and the Remarks above. p. 2.

But

But you go in your virulent strain, and tell the World that it is not likely; those who upon their own bare Authority, and private Sentiments reject what Authors they please—should with much kindness listen to the Ancient Liturgies of Saint Peter, Saint James the Elder, Saint James the Younger, and Saint Matthew, or value the Testimonies of Saint Dionysius Saint Paul's Scholar, Saint Martialis [you should have added, Saint Dionysius his companion into France,] Clemens Romanus, Ignatius, Andreas, &c. they must suffer too. The Servant is not better than his Master, &c. who would not guess by this stinging farewell, that the Learned Men of the Church of England had served our Saviour as bad as they have done these Liturgies, Dennis, Martialis, Andreas, &c. and that they had denied him as well as them. I must tell you, Mr. Selater, that your Book is one of the most disingenuous, that I ever met with, and that this passage deserves much severer Language than I shall bestow upon it: but your Conclusion of it is just as true, (and not one jot more) as that of our rejecting what Authors we please upon our own bare Authority and private Sentiments: which I shall now examine, and go through the Authors, and Liturgies you put down.

For the Liturgies then first you tell us you do not know why these Ancient Liturgies should be rejected, &c. to which I can answer you as briefly, that I do believe you that you do not; but if you would take a little Heretical advice, I could direct you to those who might inform your Ignorance herein; but I believe you are too angry at me before this time to take my advice. Against the Liturgies I have these things to urge first, An Universal Silence concerning them for many Ages of the Church, that of Saint James being the first heard of, and that not till after the Fifth General Council, being first mentioned in the Council held in Trullo, which was under Justinian Rhinotmetus in the Sixth Century. Eusebius, than whom no one was more accurate and careful to find out the Writings of those famous Persons whom he speaks of in his History, among all the Catalogues he reckons up of the particular Apostles and First Fathers, does not make the least mention of any of these Liturgies. All Saint Jerome's care in his time could not furnish us with one Syllable about such

such *Liturgies*; which reasons together with those taken from the *Liturgies* themselves have satisfied all reasonable Men that there were no such genuine things. No Body now (I mean no Learned Man) believes Saint Peter's *Liturgy*, the demonstrative Arguments against which are many, it makes mention of Saint Cyprian and Cornelius the Bishop of Rome, it prays for the Patriarch, and the very Religious Emperours. I could furnish you with more intrinsick Arguments against it and against the rest which labour under the same or worse Absurdities out of your own (to omit our)

Authors; the ¹ present Learned and Judicious Sorbonist Du Pin hath gathered enough against it and the rest to prove them all supposititious: if you have a mind to shew any parts in this sort of

Learning, I do not question, but the worthy Doctor, or some one here in England for him, will give all due satisfaction in the point, but alas, Sir, you seem to me, who judge of you by your Book, to be far from able to meddle in such matters. One *Liturgy* of yours he hath not encountered, that of Saint James the Elder, not because he had nothing to object against it, but because there was no such *Liturgy* to be objected against: but you may pass for a Discoverer, and a bringer to light of Ancient Authors, and though you be denied a place with Balzamus and such, yet no Body can deny you one with honest Annus Viterbiensis.

After all in defence of your self, some Body wiser than some Body having I suppose put it into your head, that these same *Liturgies* were not altogether unquestionable, you gravely tell us in your Preface that it was not your business to assert the *Authors* of them, &c. To which I answer, that it is very well for you that it was not, since I am sure you are a very unfit Man for any such thing; so that now you your self are content that these *Liturgy-Authors* should suffer as well as pag. 28. their Master. You say next, that it is enough for your purpose, if they be allow'd of that Antiquity, that may give them some competent interest in Tradition; to be short with you, they are not allowed any Authority, since not onely ours, but your own Authors, Du Pin for example, have proved them in- pag. 22. vinciblement,

¹ Nouvelle Bibliotheque des Auteurs
&c. des *Liturgies* Faussement Attribué es aux Apôtres. p. 21, 22, 23, 24. A. Paris. 1686.

vinciblement, (as he words it) *supposititious* and *Novel*, either of which is enough to ruine *them*, and hinder *their* having their place in *Tradition*.

pag. 28. These things are sufficient to shew that I need not say *one word* to your *Authorities* for *Transubstantiation* out of these forged *Liturgies*: I will onely remark that you begin very unluckily with *them*, and for your first, *Blessed God*, by whom we are vouchsafed to change the immaculate Body of Christ, and his precious Bloud, &c. I would fain know into what the Priests were vouchsafed to change the Immaculate Body of Christ, and his Bloud. This is *Transubstantiation* with a vengeance. I thought your business had been to prove, that the Bread is changed into the Body, the Wine into the very Bloud of Christ, but here for a leading Card, the Body and Bloud of Christ are changed into Bread and Wine, or something else. Well for a Man that keeps to his Text I know no Body like you, and for supererogating no Body can come near you. I question not but if you had a mind, you could very easily prove, that the *Transubstantiation* is to be from Body to Bread, not from Bread into Body; but this it is to be a Read Man, when a Man can with a wet Finger prove either way; and I verily believe you can as easily do the one as the other, and bring as many *Fathers* for the one as for the other: But farewell *Liturgies*, I must now inquire about Saint *Dionysius*, against whom you say we have such pitifull *Objections*.

pag. 29. Had you offered any reason for your calling them pitifull *Objections*, it would have looked something like a *Scholar*, but he that catcheth you at that, may have you for nothing: So that since you will not let me answer you, I must say what I can for the *Objections* against Saint *Dennis* his being a *Writer*.

Eusebius is as much a Witness for us here, as against the *Liturgies*, though he speaks of Saint *Dennis* the *Areopagite*, yet he gives not any hint of any *Writings* of his, a thing he is always so carefull about, when he speaks of any of those venerable *Ancients*. Saint *Hierome* is as silent as to any *Writings* of his: But that which is more than these two *Negative Arguments*, the first Men that produced these *supposititious Writings* of Saint *Dionysius* were *Hereticks*, and the first time was

was in the *sixth Century* at a Conference held in the *Emperour Justinian's Palace* betwixt the *Catholicks* and the *Severian Hereticks* who produced them but as *dubious* or *probable* at most (*sicut suspicamini*, as the *Catholicks* told them) but were rejected by the *Catholick Bishops* upon the very same reasons I have urged against them : as I urged that *Eusebius* would have known of them, had there been any such Writings, so They urge that *St. Athanasius* would have made use of them at *Nice* against *Arius* ;

as I urged that *St. Hierom* would have mentioned them, so they urge that *St. Cyril* [of *Alexandria*] would have known of them. But besides these sufficient reasons, the *Books* themselves are the *greatest Evidence* of all, they being writ in a *style* quite different from the *Apostolical Times*, and treating of *matters* after such a different manner, and of *things unknown* to those times : if you desire to see these things proved and instanced in, do but look into one of your own Writers the *Learned Sorbonist* I have mentioned above ; and then tell me, how you could call these Arguments pitiful Objections, which are perfect Demonstrations of these Writings of *St. Dionysius* their being forged, so that we must set *St. Denys* aside, and call in his Companion *St. Martial*.

But before we try him, I would fain know what you mentioned him for, you make no use of him or his *Epistles* in your *Book* : this is such a strange piece of hardiness of you, that I cannot but wonder at it ; Methinks you had business enough on your hands to prove the *Genuineness* of your other Authors and *Liturgies*, and needed not to have brought in him by head and shoulders hither, whom I will soon dispatch ; now he is here, and tell you that there was no such Man in those Times, and therefore no *Epistles* of his. ⁿ *Du Pin* hath put the true *Martial* [if there ever were really such a Person] in the third Century, but for the *Epistles* (which ^o *Bellarmino* had rejected as *spurious* long ago) he says, that no body doubts their being *suppositions*, which is a great mistake in this *Learned Man*, since you, *Mr. Sclaiger*, believe the contrary concerning them.

Ita en'm Testimonia quæ vos dicitis Dionysii Arcopagite et, unde potestis ostendere vera esse, sicut suspicamini : si enim ejus erant, non potuissent latere Beatorum Cyrillum quando & Beatus Athanasius, si pro certo scisset ejus fuisse, ante omnia in Nicæno concilio testimonia protulisset adversus Arian-Bisphemas Collatio CP. in T. 4. Concilior. p. 176. Edit. Collart.

Du Pin's N. Bibliothheque, p. 89, 90, 91, &c.

n Nouvelle Bibliothheque, &c. p. 496. o In Martiali Le-movicensi ap. Lib. de scriptor. E.

And truly I know not how to bring the *honest Doctor* off, unless his meaning was, that *no body* that had *any learning* or sense *did*, as I verily believe *he* meant, so that you may, if you will, tell *him*, as the late *Hierusalem Synod* have in effect the famous *Monsieur Claude*, that they are not ignorant and unlearned.

Having dispatch'd *St. Martial*, *St. Clemens Romanus* is next put up, whose genuine famous *Epistle* to the *Corinthians* we do with all *Antiquity* admit and admire; the doubtfull fragment of the *second Epistle* with ¹ *Eusebius* and *Antiquity* we cannot admit to the same honour the other enjoys, however we'l not quarrel about it, since I see nothing out of it in Controversy betwixt us: the *Constitutions* are the things in question among us, against the genuineness of which (tho' you like your self offer not a syllable of *Argument* here for them) I have this to say, that ^m *Eusebius* rejects them in express terms as *spurious*, if they be the same work that in his time went under the name of *Doctrina Apostolorum*, as the Opinion of some is; but tho' these are not the same book, yet *Eusebius* doth ex *Consequenti* condemn them, when he admits of nothing either as *genuine* or *probable* besides the two *Epistles*. We have the same silence in *St. Hierom* as to these *Constitutions*, and therefore an *Argument* from him against them; but without either of them, I think it is enough to say they are infected with *Arianism*, to omit other faults, as *Phorius* long since charged upon them, and therefore cannot be the *genuine work* of *Clemens Romanus*.

S. Ignatius his seven *genuine Epistles* we receive with all readiness, so that he does not suffer among us as well as his *Master*. But for your next Author *Andreas*, I must confess I am mightily at a loss, I can hear no news of such an Author any where, I have examined *Eusebius* and *St. Hierom*, our Excellent *Dr. Cave*, your *Bellarmino*, and your learned *Sorbonist Du Pin*, and cannot hear one word of such an Author. However you quote him, and in your Margin over against the Passage out of him I find *Lib. de Passione D.* by which I suppose you mean a book of *St. Andrews* concerning the *Passion* of our Lord. I must now therefore question with you, whether there be really such a book as you quote? I am
sorry

¹ *Hist. Eccl.*
clef. l. 3.
c. 38. *Edit.*
Vales.

^m *Hist. Eccl.*
clef. l. 3.
c. 38.

^{||} *Hist. Eccl.*
l. 3.
c. 38.

Photii Biblioth. num.
312.

R. 30.

sorry I am forc't to tell you hereupon, that you have discovered an intolerable and wretched Ignorance, and have exposed it more to the World your own self, than any enemy could have done it for you. I must tell you that you have most filially imposed upon your self, and that I wonder that your new Superiours (who, I am assured, perused and examined your book) should suffer the cheat upon you, and license you to put it upon the World. The Book you quote is the Passion of St. Andrew himself, of which I hope I need not any Arguments to prove that himself was not the Author. * The * Apud Sa-book is said to have been writ by the Presbyters of Achaia present at his Martyrdom. But that it is a spurious book I need not urge our own Men ^a Dr. Cave, &c. onely, but your own ^{30 Novem.} Du Pin, who (upon reasons able to destroy the credit of it ^{p. 619.} wholly) says that ^b at least it ought to be considered as a doubt-^{lon. 1575.} full writing, which according to St. Hierom, one cannot make use ^a of to prove any Article of Faith; as you have made Transub-^{Philo. Eccl.} stantiation to be. I have been the more particular about these ^{p. 5.} Liturgies and Authors to let you see how impertinent, and how ^b unjuſt your railing at our Church about these Books was, and ^{Nouvelle} to expose your gross ignorance to your new Superiours, that ^{Bibliothe-} they also may see (which perhaps they did not know before) ^{que des Au-} how unfit a man you were to meddle with this sort of learn-^{teurs Eccle-} ing, and how wretchedly you have come off. ^{siastiques,} ^{p. 48.}

CHAP. XIX.

The Authorities from Ignatius, Justin Martyr and Irenæus for Transubstantiation answered.

I come now to examine, as they come to hand, your several Authorities for Transubstantiation: the Liturgies as spurious are already dispatched. The first of your Authorities from Ignatius, (which you needed not, if you really did, go to Theodoret for, since it is now common in Ignatius himself from the Florentine Copy) that the Hereticks [that denied Christ had a true Body] abstained from the Eucharist, because

- P. 30. *they do not confess the Eucharist to be the Flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ, &c.* does you no service, because *We* of the Church of England who do not believe any Transubstantiation, say with St. Ignatius, that the Sacrament is the Body and Blood of Christ. However as we say that it is figuratively such, so there is nothing here to determine that St. Ignatius meant otherwise than we do, since his Argument is as strong (not to say stronger) in a figurative sense against the Hereticks; it
- ^{a Contr.}
 Marc. l. 4.
 c. 40. invincibly proving (as ^a Tertullian does upon the very same account) that our Saviour had a true Body, since none but such could have a figurative Body, or Figure: a Figure of a Figure or Phantome being perfect nonsense: so that St. Ignatius is no help to prove a Transubstantiation, and your reasoning upon it ridiculous, since if the Hereticks had owned the Eucharist with Calvin or Zuinglius to have been the sign or Figure of Christs Body, they had quite ruined their own doctrine, and had allowed Christ to have had a true Body, since none but such could have a Sign or Figure: but some Men are so fond of saying something, that so it be but said, they matter not, whether it be for, or against themselves, which this your reasoning really is. Your next Authority from St. Denys, as spurious is to no purpose; nor your next upon the same account from your Andreas, who, methinks as an Apostle, should have had the place of St. Denys, and both of them before St. Ignatius; but you I suppose either found them in this order, or thought Ignatius fittest to be put first, because he looked a little more to your purpose than either of them: Tho' as to the latter of them, your Andreas, had you but shewn any ingenuity in what you cite from him, he would have proved full as little to your purpose, but you cunningly slip over in this short passage that which would have told you that the Sacrifice here spoken of could be no other than a figurative and representative Sacrifice, since it is said to be offered in *altari crucis, upon the Altar of the Cross*; which you wisely tho' not over honestly leave out to make your Author speak something towards the purpose we meet him here for. Your Note upon this Passage that *truly eaten excludes eating in sign only or Spirit* does as much discover your ignorance of the Sense of the Genuine Fathers, as your Phrase in *sign only* does
 your

your malice, who cannot but know that the Church you have forsaken never said so : to say that he which eats both in Sign and Spirit, does not eat truly, is to give the lye to a whole Tract of S. ^(b) *Austins*, where among twenty other ^(b) *Tracta* Confutations you may find that such Persons as *Moses*, *Aaron* ^{ius 26} in and *Phineas*, who pleased God, *visibilem cibum spiritualiter* ^{Joann.} intellexerunt, spiritualiter esurierunt, spiritualiter gustaverunt ut spiritualiter satiarentur; did spiritually understand the visible Food [the Manna,] did spiritually hunger after and taste of it, that they might be spiritually filled and satisfied : and that the true eating the Bread of Life so as not to dye does belong ^(c) to the virtue of the Sacrament, and not to the visible Sacrament : ^(c) *Pertinent ad virtutem Sacramenti, non ad visibile Sacramentum.* and that the true receiver is he who eateth inwardly, not outwardly, who eateth with the heart, and not he who presseth it with his teeth.

mentum. Qui manducat intus non foris, qui manducat in corde, non qui premis dente. August. Tract. 26. in Joan,

Justin Martyr you next cite, saying, 'Tis not common Bread P. 31. or common Drink we take, how then ? Why as the Word of God, *Jesus Christ* our Saviour, was made Flesh, so we are taught that our Nourishment by Prayer, proceeding from him, being made the Eucharist, to be the Flesh and Blood of the same incarnate *Jesus*, &c. This Translation I accuse not onely of falshood, and of perverting the plain sense of *St. Justin*, but of direct Nonsense : for first whereas *St. Justin* sayes, We do not receive these things [the consecrated Bread and the consecrated Wine mingled with Water] A S common Bread or common Drink, you make him say that 'tis not common Bread, or common Drink we take: which is directly contrary to the true sense of his Words, which are so far from denying, that they evidently suppose and prove them to be still Bread and Wine after Consecration, or else they could not be received in a different manner from that at common Meals. Again, whereas our Author goes on but as by the Word of God, *Jesus Christ* our Saviour being incarnate,

Ἄνθρωπος γὰρ ὡς κοινὸν ἄρτον ἐδὲ κοινὸν ποτὶμα ταῦτα λαμβάνομεν, ἀλλ' ὅν τερον, διὰ λόγου θεοῦ σαρκοποιήθη. Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ὁ σωτὴς ἡμῶν, καὶ σὰρκα καὶ αἷμα ὑπὲρ σωτηρίας ἡμῶν ἔγεν, ὅπως καὶ τὸν δι' εὐχῆς λόγον τὰ παρ' αὐτοῦ εὐχαριστήσαντες τροφὴν, ἔξ ἧς αἷμα καὶ σὰρκες κατὰ μεταβολὴν τρέφονται ἡμῶν, ἐκείνου τὸ σαρκοποιήθη. Ἰησοῦ καὶ σὰρκα καὶ αἷμα ἐδιδάχθημεν εἶναι. S. Just. M. A. pol. 2. p. 98. Edit. Morel. Paris. 1636.

carname,

carnate, had both Flesh and Blood for our Salvation, you nonsensically translate him, as the Word of God, Jesus Christ our Saviour, was made Flesh, where you not only lame his sense and obscure it, but quite pervert it, you making the Word of God to be our Saviour himself, the second Person in the Trinity, whereas Justin means by it the Power of the Holy Ghost, which over-shadowed the Blessed Virgin. I will give you but another touch of your nonsense; and that is when you translate, so we are taught that our nourishment by prayer — to be the flesh, instead of, is the flesh I hate so mean an employment as to be thus taken up in ripping up your pitiful dealing, or else I could expose you further from this very passage out of Justin; but I think this enough to let you and your new Superiors see what wretched stuff we are like to be put off with, and how vastly unfit you are to meddle about such things.

To leave then this miserable murdering of Justin, I come now to see what you would have thence; suppose you had known, which you did not, what the Author meant here. You argue our Saviour was made Flesh, therefore the Eucharist is Flesh, or Justin could not say they were so taught. I answer, That as our Saviour was not Transubstantiated when he took our flesh upon him, so no more need was there that the Bread should be transubstantiated to become his Sacramental Body and Blood. Nay, St. Justin directly supposes the contrary when he makes the Eucharist to be Bread, tho'

* Which words you suppress in your translation. Was you afraid we should conclude from them that Just. Mart. did not think the Accidents did subsist in the Eucharist without the Substance? But let that pass.

not received then as common Bread, and proves it too, when he says * that by this consecrated nourishment [the Body and Blood of Christ] our Bodies, our Flesh and Blood are nourished, which I am sure your learned men will grant to be impious to say of the natural very Body and Blood of Christ, and impossible if no substance but that be there. So that it is evident that by the Body and Blood of Christ in this passage must be meant Christ his Symbolical Body and Blood, or the Sign or Figure of his Natural Body and Blood, the substance as well as accidents of the Elements remaining.

As to the reason you add, that *Justin* should have told the *Emperor* (if he meant no more by it) that by the *Flesh* and *Blood* of *Christ*, he intended only the *Signs* of them, since it was, he knew, objected to the *Christians* his *Brethren*, that in the *Mysteries* of their *Religion* they did eat *mans* flesh : I do retort it upon you, and challenge you to shew, where they ever pleaded guilty, or where they ever made any *Apology* for, or distinction about their eating our *Saviours* *Natural* *Flesh* and *Blood*, tho' they abstained from the *Blood* of every thing else, as any one that is but little conversant in the first *Antiquity* knows they constantly pleaded against the so often objected *dapes Thyestes* ; upon this point ^b *St. Austin*, as quoted by *Grati-*
rian, is so express both against your reason and your opinion, that I cannot omit it here, he sayes, Nothing is more reason-
 able than that as we have received the similitude of his, to wit-
 ness *Christ's* death in *Baptism*, so we should also receive the likeness
 of his *Flesh*, and drink the likeness of his *Pretious* *Blood* ;
 that so neither may *Truth* be wanting in the *Sacrament*, nor *Pa-*
gans have an occasion of ridiculing us for drinking the *Blood*
 of one that was slain. Which it seems *Pagans* would then
 have done ; had the *Christians* then talked of drinking lite-
 rally *Christ's* *Natural* *Blood* : and the *Jews* and *Mahometans*
 do now do, since some *Christians* took up an *Opinion*, and
 talked of doing it in a *literal* *sense*, witness that severe *Ob-*
servance and *Reflexion* of *Averroes* upon them sufficiently
 known.

b Nihil ra-
 tionabilius,
 ut quia nos
 in Baptismo
 accipimus,
 similitudi-
 nem quoque
 carnis ejus
 sumamus,
 & similitu-
 dine preti-
 osi sangui-
 nis potes-
 mur: ita
 ut, & ve-
 ritas non
 desit in Sa-

cramento, & ridiculum nullum sit Paganis, quod cruorem occisi hominis bibamus. Aug.
 apud Grat. de Consecr. Dist. 2. Sect. ultimum. p. 1958. Edit. Taur.

Your first place from *St. Irenaeus* is not exactly translated,
 cum panem in quo gratia acta sint, &c. is not barely that
Bread in the *Eucharist* is the *Body* of *Christ* ; but that that
Bread, which hath been consecrated is the *Body* of his *Lord*.
 This passage is so far from being for, that it is directly
 against you ; that *Bread* which hath been consecrated is demon-
 stration that he looked upon it, as to the substance to be
Bread still ; here you were forced to shew us a little of your
 Le-

Legerdemain, or else I am sure this Chapter of *Irenæus* had been secure enough from your quoting it, there being that in the middle of this passage (which you have slyly left out) which is perfect demonstration against Transubstantiation

^b while St. *Irenæus* argues for the immortality of our bodies from *their having been nourished by the Body and Blood of Christ* : and as much against you is your next passage from him, and as well translated by you, for as that which is Bread from the Earth, perceiving (very wise Bread truly this same was) the call of God [or as I would say, being consecrated] now is not common Bread, but the Eucharist, consisting of two things, one earthly (i. e. the accidents) and the other Spiritual : so our bodies receiving the Eucharist are not now corruptible, having the hope of the Resurrection. What can be more plain against Transubstantiation than this place, which still supposes it to be Bread, when it says that after Consecration it is not common Bread ; had *Irenæus* taught or believed a Transubstantiation here, he must have said that after Consecration it is not Bread at all, and not have talked of a terrestrial or corporeal thing or part in the Eucharist, as well as a heavenly or spiritual : but you say this earthly part is the accidents. I would fain know, what part of St. *Irenæus* or the *Ancients* you learned this from, I am sure you ought to be ashamed of talking at this ridiculous rate ; there is any Body scarce, but knows that earthly and material or corporeal are *Synonymous*, but you however contrary to all Reason, and all Philosophy, must be setting up material Accidents, and you might as well have told us of incorporeal bodies, and corporeal nothings, as of earthly Accidents : but such inconsistent ridiculous stuff will down it seems with a man that believes Transubstantiation.

p. 31. Your talk about imposing a new signification upon the Bread and Wine is nothing to the purpose, since our Church makes the Elements not only to signify, but to communicate to us the Body and Blood of Christ after a spiritual and heavenly manner, which thing requires an Omnipotent Power for the insinuating it for such an effect, and enduing it with such a virtue or power.

CHAP. XX.

His several Proofs from Tertullian answered, and his Falsification of that Author exposed.

Tertullian your next Author you have abused worse than St. Justin, I must profess that when I first took your Book into my hand, I did expect you would have had the prudence to have let him and Theodoret alone: but it seems all the Fathers either are for Transubstantiation, or you will make them so.

It is pleasant to see what shuffling you make about your first quotation from him, and how afraid you are of his, *id est Figura Corporis mei*, that you durst not translate it; and next how sillily or rather falsely you english *nisi veritatis esset Corpus*, unless it had been the truth. There needs nothing else to impeach your attempt of ignorance, and a depraving Tertullian than the putting his own words together. p. 32.

† He made [speaking of our Saviour] that [Bread] his Body, when he said This is my Body; that is the Figure of my Body: Now it could not have been the Figure, unless there were a true Body [of Christ] since an empty thing as a Phantome really is, can have no figure of it self. I appeal now

to your own self as well as to the world, whether any thing can be more direct against Transubstantiation, than this passage put together, and fairly translated. Nor can you make any thing out of his *fecit*. since he does not only sufficiently explain himself here, but a very little lower, he asks Marcion deriding him, * how our Saviour came to call Bread his Body,

and not rather a Pompon? And then tells him that Bread was the ancient Figure of our Saviours Body in that passage of *pus suum* *appellat*, & non magis pponem, quem Marcion cordis loco habuit? Non intelligens veterem fuisse istam figuram corporis Christi dicentis per Jeremiam, &c. Idem eodem loco.

l.

Jeremy

† Corpus suum illum fecit, hoc est Corpus meum dicendo, id est Figura Corporis mei: Figura enim non fuisset, nisi veritatis esset corpus ceterum vacua res, quod est Phantasma figuram capere non posset. Tert. c. Marcion. l. 4. c. 40. Edit. Franck.

* Cur autem panem Corpus suum appellat, &

Jeremy ch. 11. 19. according to the Version of the Septuagint.) So that what you would infer from the quotation is altogether groundless: and your next argument is worse that there is no such repugnancy between the Body of Christ, and the Sign and Figure of his Body, for if it is the Body, it cannot be the Figure; if it be the Figure only, it cannot be the Body. But some men can believe as well as say any thing.

p. 33. You next furnish us with a plain Declaration from Tertullian, that the Flesh is fed with the Body and Blood of Christ, &c. You ought to have put down here, whether you quoted this place for, or against, Transubstantiation: a man would suspect you had here turned the Tables, since this place is perfect Demonstration against Transubstantiation, while it makes our bodies to be fed with Christs Body, to affirm which of his Natural Body is imjious among your own learned men as well as us: but of this distinctly before we part.

The bare Translation of the first passage you quoted, and I translated clearly, from Tertullian is answer enough to all
p. 33. your silly borrowed Criticism about Representation. I come now to your last place from him, which I accuse of a direct falsification of the Text, as well as of perverting the sense of our Author. This you and your new Superiors may think a heavy charge, and that I ought to have examined well, before I laid it upon you: to tell you and the world the truth, I did; for I did not rely onely on my own notes, nor on the Franker Edition of Junius of 1597. out of which I had them, and which I again consulted on this occasion, but I examined these several Editions, that of Rhenannus at Basil 1528. which was the second Edition of Tertullian, whom Rhenannus printed the first time there, in 1521. I cannot find by his notes that this his second differed at all in this place in controversie from his first Edition; at the Margin of this Edition over against the passage Non sciet Maritus, &c. which you quote, he puts Eucharistia in Capital Letters, and in his Notes guesses that dicitur hath been mistook for benedicuntur. I examined also another Edition of Rhenannus at Basil 1539. a third of his at Paris 1545. that of Pamelius with Latinus and Mercer at Cologne 1617. that of de La Barre at Paris 1580. that of de La Cerda at Paris 1624. that best Edition of Rigaltius at Paris 1634. the Annotationes Diver-

Diverſorum upon *Tertullian*, wherein *this paſſage* is ſo often quoted and commented upon, printed at *Paris* 1635. that of *F. George* the *Capuchin* at *Paris* 1646, ---48, ---50. and laſtly that in *C. Moreau's Tertull. Omniloquium Alphabet.* at *Paris* 1657. So that I ſuppoſe I may after an exact and troubleſome ſearch of theſe eleven ſeveral Editions, be allowed to tell you, that you have falſified *Tertullian* by leaving *Panem* out of this ſhort quotation, which every one of theſe Editions hath, to which *Panem*, the *illum* doth relate, and not to *Chriſt* : ſo that to confute you, I need but reſtore *Tertullian* to himſelf, whom you make to ſay, *Thy Husband ſhall not know what thou doſt taſte before all other meats ;* (which Translation I allow, tho' ſome tranſlate it interrogatively) and if he ſhall know, he doth not believe it to be Him, whom it is ſaid to be ; whereas his own words are, and tho' he ſhall know it to be BREAD, he doth not believe it to be THAT Bread, which it is ſaid to be, to wit *Enchariſtical* or *Bleſſed* Bread.

Let any one compare our two Translations with *Tertullian's* own words, and then let him freely give ſentence betwixt us.

*Non ſciens
Maritus
quid ſecurus
ante om-
nem cibum
et ſi ſciere-
rit P A-
NEM, non
illum cre-
dit eſſe qui
dicitur.
Tertull. ad
Uxorem.
l. 2. c. 5.
Edit.
Franck.*

CH A P. XXI.

The Proofs from Clemens Alex. Origen, Hilary, Gregory Naz. Baſil and Macarius answered.

YOUR next paſſage out of *Clemens Alexandrinus* is not a jot to your purpoſe. It were eaſie for me to bring places out of him directly contrary to *Transubſtantiation*, but I have been forced to be ſo long in expoſing and confuting your Authorities hitherto, that I muſt omit them, and ſhorten my answers as much as I can, having already ruined your beſt ſtrength. p. 33.

The ſeveral paſſages out of *Origen* can do you no more ſervice than thoſe already answered, and are as well tranſlated by you. You have diſcovered a groſs ignorance in the

translation of the first Passage from him. What Nonsense do you make with translating *in Specie*, first *in kind* then *in form*; when as it is plain enough that by *in Specie* is meant clearly in opposition to the darkness of the legal Types. As to the *Christian* now eating the *Flesh*, and drinking the *Blood* of him, who said his *Flesh* was truly *Meat*, and his *Blood* Drink indeed, &c. (Which is the strength of your three first Proofs;) had you been conversant in *Origen's Writings*, had you but read his *Homilies* on the *Book* next before this out of which you quote, I mean on *Leviticus*, you might have been sufficiently fore-armed against taking these Expressions in a literal sense; while *Origen* would have told you, that there is a letter [or literal Expressions] in the Gospel, which kills him, (look to your self Mr. Sclater) who doth not understand spiritually the things it speaks, and he instances in this very thing: for if

*Est & in
novo Testa-
mento lite-
ra, quæ oc-
cidat eum,
qui non spi-
ritualiter*

quæ dicuntur intelligit. Si enim secundum literam sequaris, hoc ipsum quod dictum est, nisi manducaveris Carnem meam, & biberis Sanguinem meum, occidit hæc litera. Orig. Hom. 7. in Levit. Basil. 1571.

P. 34. Your last place from him out of his eighth Book against *Celsus*, hath not a syllable for your *Transubstantiation*, all it says is, that the Bread which had been offered, was become or made by Consecration *σῶμα αἰών τι, & ἀπαζον τῆς μεθ' ὑμῶν* *πρότιος αἰὸς* *χρηστέων*, a sacred Body, that hath the virtue to sanctify those that do with Faith receive it. Which is what we can and do subscribe to who utterly reject *Transubstantiation*.

P. 34, 35. Your next Author is *St. Cyprian*, but since all Scholars are satisfied the Piece you quote is none of his, and the Learned *Sorbonist Du Pin* gives this short but very sharp Character of it, that it is a ridiculous Piece, and full of Imperinences; we can neither permit it a place here nor any where else: and as short I must be with you about your next Authority of the Semi-Arian *Ensebius Emisenus*, since those *Homilies* under his name are rejected as *suppositions*.

*Nouvelle Bi-
bliothèque
de Auto-
urs, &c.*

P. 472.

P. 37.

St.

St. Hilary is your next *Author*, whose words a man would believe were really thus connected, and in the same order he finds them set down by you, but I do assure every one that you are not a man to be trusted in these things. The passage ought to be divided into three distinct parts, with a mark of separation betwixt them, and which is more, the first part to be placed last, and the middle first, and the third in the middle. Certainly, Mr. Sclater, you never saw St. Hilary in your life, or you would never have been guilty of such wretched dealing, if your Skill in the *Fathers* lyes in playing such tricks with them, I do assure you I will never quote after you. But for the words themselves in their true order; tho' they seem to take our Saviour's words, my flesh is meat indeed in a strict sense (against the Doctrine of the much Antienter Writers, Tertullian, Origen and Athanasius (above quoted) who expressly reject the literal sense as dangerous and ridiculous, and therefore so may we) yet do not prove any Transubstantiation; since our Saviour may be received in St. Hilary's sense cibo Dominico, in the Eucharist (not as you very homely translate it, in our Lord's meat) with the Sacramental Bread, by an Union with it, which a your own quotation out of your St. James's Liturgy would teach, without any Annihilation of the substance of the Bread, which I believe St. Hilary never so much as dreamed of, and therefore could be no Patron of your Novel Doctrine of Transubstantiation.

Jesus Christ, are the words of the Priest, when he breaks the Bread, The Union of the most Holy Body, and precious Blood of our Lord. *Page. 28.*

Gregory Nazianzen's first passage says no more than our Church, which calls the Sacred Elements the Body and Blood of Christ, and directs her Communicants to pray that they may worthily eat the Flesh and drink the Blood of Christ. As to your Observation, that St. Gregory's advice had been needless, if we did onely eat the flesh of Christ in sign and figure: had you been skilfull, (as I suppose you are willing enough to be do not pre-thought) in his Writings, you might have found, as ridiculous as you think it, St. Gregory himself calling the Blessed Bread and Wine, the Antitypes or figures of the Body and Blood of

of *Christ*, in that *very Oration* you your self next quote, and within a dozen lines of that *very place* you produce thence; where he tells us that his Sister *Gorgonia*, in a great sickness

Et si quid aspiciam Antityporum pretiosi corporis aut sanguinis manus reconsiderat, id lacrymis admiscuisset, & rem admirandam, statim liberatam se morbo sentit. Greg. Naz. Orat. 11. in *Laudem Gorgoniae*, p. 187. Edit. Paris, 1630.

mingled her tears with the *Antitypes* or *Symbols* of our *Saviour's* precious *Body* and *Blood*, with as many of them as she had treasured up. I hope you do not believe that she had as many *Bodies* of *Christ*, as she had in her hands parts of these *Antitypes*, which I do assure you do mean nothing more than *Signs*

or *Figures*. This passage hath not onely confuted your first, but provided fully against the second out of him, about his Sister *Gorgonia* her prostrating her self before the *Altar* with Faith, and praying to him with great clamour (as you neatly translate it) who is worshipped upon the *Altar*. Upon this you tell us gravely, that she prayed not to *Bread* and *Wine*, and I tell you, that she prayed no more unto the *Host*, since neither our *Bread* and *Wine*, nor your *Host* were then upon the *Altar*, for it was at *Midnight* that *Gorgonia* went privately into the *Church*, when there was no *Priest*, nor *Service*, nor *Eucharist* or *Host* to be worshipped, but she alone, as far as we can gather from *St. Gregory*, prostrated before the *Altar*, at or upon which God is worshipped. But some Men if they get a little thing by the end, that looks as if it might do them a *Service*, quickly lay hold of it; and never consider the connexion it hath in the *Discourse* from whence it is taken; if you had but read this *Oration* you so readily quote, and had but considered it, it might have saved you the making two silly remarks.

p. 38.

Desperatis omnibus aliis auxiliis ad mortaliu omnium medicum confugit, atq; in tempesta nocte captata, cum morbus non nihil remississet, ad Altare, &c. Idem eadem Oratione, p. 186.

p. 39.

You quote next *St. Basil's Book*, *De Baptismo*, c. 2. whereas the *St. Basil* that I use Printed at *Paris* hath two *Books* *de Baptismo*; in the second of which under the third *Question* I find what you quote, but cannot find that it is any thing to your purpose: we say with him that every one ought to prepare for the worthy receiving this holy *Sacrament*, and that the worthy Receiver is made Partaker of the *Body* and *Blood* of *Christ*. In his *Antiphone* the *Bread* and *Wine* are called the *Types* or *Figures* of the *Body* and *Blood* of *Christ*.

As

As far from helping to prove *Transubstantiation* are the two p. 39. first passages from *Macarius*; that he understood the eating the *Flesh* and drinking the *Blood* of *Christ* in the *Catholic*, that is, in the *spiritual* sense, is past question evident from his 27. *Homily*,¹ where among other things that the *Saints* before our *Saviour's* time were ignorant of, he reckons this, that in the Church should be offered *Bread* and *Wine*, *Antitypes* or *Symbols* of the *Body* and *Blood* of *Jesus Christ*; and that those which eat of this *Visible Bread*, should spiritually eat the *Flesh* of the *Lord*. This passage is so convictive of it self, that it needs not help to inforce it against all literal eating of *Christ's Body* and *Blood*, and against *Transubstantiation*. need say nothing to your last *Testimony* from him, nor shall, onely that your *Translation* of this short passage is very silly, and very false too. Do you or your new *Supersourers* look at it again, and then deny it, if you can.

μαρτυροῦντες τὴν σὰρκα τοῦ κυρίου ἐδίωκον. *Macar. Homil. 27. pag. 164. Edit. Paris. 1621.*

CHAP. XXII.

Arguments for Transubstantiation from Gregory Nyssen and Cyril of Hierusalem answered, and a ridiculous Mistake of Mr. Sclater's observed.

Gregory Nyssen's *Testimonies* are the next you do produce p. 40. to prove a *Transubstantiation*, and do indeed promise more in order to it, than any you have hitherto produced, while they say that the *sanctified Bread* is changed into the *Body* of the *Word* of *God*. However that *Gregory Nyssen* meant no change of the substance of the *Bread* and *Wine*, or that they were annihilated, and the *Body* and *Blood* of *Christ* substituted into their place, but meerly a change in their *Use*, *Office* and *Virtue*, is past all question evident, since in another place he illustrates this change of the *Elements* of *Bread* and *Wine* by, and compares it to, that of the *Altar*, which I hope you do not

Nam & Al- not believe, or any of your Party dare say, that upon its be-
 tare hoc san- ing dedicated to the Service of God, it undergoes any change
 ctum, cuius- of Substance, but meerly a change of use, it being now sepa-
 ratiſimus, la- rated to God's Service, which before was of common use, and
 pis est na- for the most common Services He compares it to the
 turâ com- change in a Priest, which is not of the Substance of his
 munis... Body when he is ordained, but of his Soul onely by an
 sed quoniam Dei cultui invisible Grace, which qualifies him for the particular office
 consecra- of a Priest. He compares it to the change of Water in Bap-
 tum...Al- tism, which all the world will grant is not in the substance,
 zare imma- but in the virtue onely, through the benediction of the
 culatum est...Panis
 item, panis divine Grace.
 est initio

communis: sed ubi cum Mysterium sacrificaverit, Corpus Christi fit & dicitur.---Eadem
 item Verbi vis etiam Sacerdotem augustum & honorandum facit, novitate Benedictionis à
 communitate Vulgi segregatum.—cum nihil vel corpore vel formâ mutatus — ille sit, qui erat,
 invisibili quadam vi, ac gratiâ, invisibilem animam in melius transformatam gerens.—
 Ac simili rationum consequentiâ, etiam aqua, cum nihil aliud sit quam aqua, supernâ Gratiâ
 benedicente ei, in eam, qua mente percipitur, hominem renovat regenerationem. Greg. Nyss.
 in Baptismum Christi Oratio, p. 802, 803. Edit. Paris. 1615.

I could bring his Comparison of the change of the Bread and Wine in the Eucharist to that of Christ, but these I have brought, I think, are more than enough to prove that our Gregory Nyssen meant no other change of the Elements than a change of Use, of Office, and of Virtue; and that if your people are resolved that he shall mean a change of Substance, we shall have Transubstantiations enough, then the Water in Baptism is no Water, though it seem such to all Senses, but is transubstantiated into a divine Grace; and you and I when we were ordained were really transubstantiated into the meer Office of a Priest, and for all our eating and drinking are as meer Accidents as those in the Eucharist: one thing I am puzzled at, and that is what the Stones of the Altar are transubstantiated into.

These, Sir, as ridiculous as they be, must be necessary Consequences of your making our Author teach Transubstantiation in the Eucharist, and all the Arts of your whole Party cannot avoid them; so that I suppose we have reason to deny you Gregory Nyssen his being a Teacher, or Favourer of
 your

your Upstart Doctrine I should before parting examine your translating *Gregory Nyss.* but I am too much in haste to stay upon such wretched blundering, onely one observation, I must advertise the young Criticks of, and that is, that *θανάτῳ* which in all other authors, signifies *put to death*, in *Greg. Nyss.* according to the sage *Mr. Sclater* signifies *made immortal.*

Cyril of Jerusalem's Testimonies do promise at first view, p. 40, 41. as much or more than the *last* from *Gregory Nyssen*, to prove all you intend them for, to wit, a *Transubstantiation*, when they not onely say with *Gregory Nyssen*, that the *Bread and Wine* after *Consecration* are made the *Body and Blood of Christ*; but which is further, that the *Bread* which is seen by us is not *Bread*, although the *tast* perceive it to be *Bread*, but the *Body of Christ*. To which I answer first, that *St. Cyril* is far from teaching *Transubstantiation* in these places; since what he says first is not denied by our Church, that the *Bread and Wine* are made by *Consecration* the *Body and Blood of Christ*, and are no longer *common Bread*, and *common Wine*, which very expressions sufficiently prove, them to be as to their *Substance Bread and Wine* still, tho' now hereby distinguished from *common Bread and Wine*. And therefore upon this very ground *Cyril* advises his *Catechumens* to consider the *Elements* consecrated, not as bare *Bread and Wine* (which certainly proves them to be so as to their substance) tho' their Senses suggested to them, that they were nothing else than bare *Elements*, but, as our Lord said they were, his *Body and his Blood*.

So that we hence give a good account of that other expression that seems the more favourable to *Transubstantiation*, about the *visible Bread* being not *Bread*, but the *Body of Christ*: which we are as ready now as *Cyril* was then, to say is not *Bread*, bare *Bread* after consecration, but the *Body of Christ*, inasmuch as it is now honoured with the Title of the *Body of Christ*, since it is made by *Consecration* the *Instrument* to make us *Partakers of the Body of Christ*, as *St. Paul* says *1 Cor. 10. 16.* and after him *Cyril* himself in this *Catechism*

M

advises

Μὴ πρῶτον ἐν ᾧς ψιλοῖς τῷ ἁρτῷ ἢ τῷ οἴνῳ σῶμα καὶ αἷμα χεῖρ κατὰ τὴν δεσποτικὴν τυγχάνει ἀπόρατον, ἐν ᾧ ἢ ἡ αἰσθησις οὐκ ὁρᾷ τοῦτο ὑποβάλλει, ἀλλὰ ἡ πίστις σὺν βασιλῆϊ. *Cyr. Myst. Catech. 4. p. 237. Edit. Paris. 1640.*

advise his Catechumens to receive with all assurance [the con-
 secrated Elements] as the Body and Blood of Christ, upon this
 very reason because under the Type or Figure of Bread is given
 [to the worthy Receiver] the Body of Christ and under that of
 Wine, is given his Blood.

μελαμ-
 βάνομεν Χειρῶ· ἐν τῷ πω δ' ἄρῳ, δίδοις σοι τὸ σῶμα, καὶ ἐν τῷ πω οἶνω, δίδοις σοι
 τὸ αἷμα. &c. Idem eodem loco.

This Passage you, (or rather Grodecius, for you do but trans-
 late him) have endeavoured to make speak for you: which is
 an easy thing to make any Authors do, if you should serve them,
 as you have done him; for 1. you make him say, Let us take
 the Body and Blood of Christ, whereas he hath, *ὡς*, here, and
 faith, let us take, to wit the consecrated Elements, AS the Bo-
 dy and Blood of Christ (which is a trick you played St. Justin
 Martyr as well as Cyril:) and then you from Grodecius tran-
 slate τῷ by species, a word unknown to the Primitive Chris-
 tians in the sense you Transubstantiatours use it in, witness

b Non vale-
 bit Christi
 sermo ut
 Species
 mutet Ele-
 mentorum
 p. 48. ex
 Ambrosio.

your own Quotations out of St. Ambrose, when as any one
 that knows but a little Greek, could tell you it means a Figure.
 But to rescue Cyril clearly out of your hands; had you but
 turned one leaf backward, you might have read that, which
 would, if you had any ingenuity in you, have hindred your
 bringing Cyril on the stage for a favourer or teacher of Tran-
 substantiation: there in his Mystigological Catechism about
 Chrism, having spoken of the use and vast benefit of it, he
 thus addressess his Auditors, but take heed

Ἀλλ' ὅρα μὴ ὑπονοήσῃς λαβεῖν τὸ
 μυστὸν ψιλὸν εἶναι ὡσπερ καὶ δ' ἄρῳ
 τῆς Εὐχαριστίας, μετὰ τὴν ἐπίκλησιν
 τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος, καὶ ἔτι ἄρῳ
 λιτός, ἀλλὰ σῶμα Χριστοῦ· ὅτω καὶ τὸ
 αἶμα τοῦτο μυστὸν, καὶ ἔτι ψιλὸν, καὶ
 ὡς ἂν ἦποι τις κοινὸν μετ' ἐπίκλησιν,
 ἀλλὰ Χριστοῦ χάρισμα. Cyr. Catechism.
 Mystag. 3. p. 235. Edit. Paris. 1640.

that thou do not think that [Chrism] to
 be bare Oyl: for as the Encharistical
 Bread after the Invocation [and illapse]
 of the Holy Spirit, is no longer ordinary
 Bread, but the Body of Christ: even so
 this holy Oyl is no longer bare or, as one
 may say, common Oyl after the Invoca-
 tion of the Holy Spirit, but Charisma
 Christi the Gift or Grace of Christ: and

a little after he sayes, the Body is anointed with the Oyl that is seen
 by us, but the Soul is sanctified by the Holy and Quickening Spirit.
 καὶ τῷ μυστῷ
 φαινομένῳ
 μυστὸν τὸ σῶμα χεῖλαι, τῷ δὲ ἁγίῳ καὶ ζωοποιῷ πνεύματι ἢ ψυχὴ ἀνδρῶν. Idem eodem
 loco.

Here

Here we meet with *as high and as strange Expressions* about the *Chrism*, as in the *next Catechism* about the *Eucharistical Bread and Wine*: as there the *Bread upon Consecration* is said to be no longer *common Bread*; just so it is said here about the *Chrism* that it is not *common Oyl* after *Consecration*; as he talks there of a *φανόμενον ἄρτον*, which you would have us to believe is no more than the bare appearance of *Bread*, so here of a *φανόμενον μύρον*, which upon the same reason must be only the appearance of *Oyl* without any *Substance*. In a word, if *St. Cyril* proves a *Transubstantiation* of the *Bread and Wine* there, he as certainly proves a *Transubstantiation* of the *Chrism-Oyl* here: if you say as all confess that he doth not prove this of the *Oyl*, I must say upon equal grounds that he doth no more prove the other of the *Bread and Wine*; so that *St. Cyril* is not for your purpose of proving *Transubstantiation*.

But before I pass to your next *Author*, I have a question to ask you, and that is, why you put down the *Text* it self of *Cyril* here? whereas your *English*, if it be your own, is word for word translated from *Grodecius* his *Latin Translation* of *St. Cyril*: I appeal to your own *Conscience*, whether what I say is not true; but since you may be too peevish to tell me, I will give an instance or two, besides those already observed, where you have both equally added to the *Text* of *St. Cyril*, or, grossly mistaken it. *St. Cyril* says τὸ ὕδωρ ποτὲ οἷς διὸν μεταβιβλῆκεν ἐν Κανῇ τῆς Γαλιλαίας, διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος [which in the last words, ^c *Aquam aliquid* you have altered into οἶκτον αἵματι,] this place you verbatim ^{mutavit in} from ^c *Grodecius* translate thus, he sometimes changed *Water* ^{vinum, quod} into *Wine*, which is neer to blood in *Cana* of *Galilee*, by his onely ^{propinquum,} *Will*; whereas according to *Grodecius* his *Greek*, there is not ^{in Cana Galilee, sola} a Syllable of such an Expression, as, which is neer to blood, and ^{voluntate:} according to yours, not a Syllable for, by his onely *Will*; and yet you two could nick it so exactly. ^{Grodec.}

But that which is the pleasantest of all is, that you not ^{Lat. Inter.} onely transcribe a Blunder of his, but make it ten times worse: *Tois υἱοῖς* *Cyril* in this Passage speaks of the *Children of the Bride-chamber*, ^{τῶν νυμφῶν.} *Grodecius* hath made them the *Children of the Bridegroom*, ^{vos. Cyril.} and you have made them the *Children of the Bride*, when you ^{[ex Luc. 5. 34.] Fili- u Sponsi.} call them the *Sons of his Sponse*; by which you mean our *Grodecil Interpr. Latina*. To the *Sons of his Sponse*, *Scilicet Engl. Translat.*

Saviour's Spouse which I am sure is *his Bride the Church*. This is translating with a witness, and this it is to make a Man's self a slave to *another Man's Translation*, which is guilty of such Blunders and Errours; and yet by putting your *Margin* full of *Greek* to make the World believe you had been at the Fountain-head your self. I must confess it is the first time I ever heard of a *He-Bride*, or could have suspected that a *Man* that hath so much *Greek* and *Hebrew* in his head would have translated *hic Sponsus*, our Saviour his Spouse.

I have been so large upon these two Fathers, St. Gregory Nyssen and St. Cyril, not onely because they are always reckoned the chiefest Authors for Transubstantiation, but because I might thereby very much shorten the *Answers* I am to make to your following *Authorities*, which I shall consider if they speak any thing new, if not, refer to some of my *Answers* already made.

CHAP. XXIII.

Those from Epiphanius, St. Ambrose and St. Chrysostom answered.

- P. 42. **Y**our Testimony out of Epiphanius proves nothing more than your Infirmary in translating, for he that believeth not that he is true, you have ridiculously made it, who believeth it not to be his very true Body. But such dealing is not strange to me to find in you, this Talent runs almost through your whole book. You are very copious in the next place from St. Ambrose; your first Testimony from him proves nothing against the Church of England, nor your second, since in our Liturgy
- P. 43. we use in the distributing the Consecrated Bread the same Expressions used then (the Body of our Lord Jesus Christ) and our People are taught to say Amen. Nor your third, fourth, and those which follow, wherein this Father uses so much of Allegory, and therefore is not to be confined to a literal Sense. Your last from him is your best one, which how-
- P. 44, 45, 46, &c. ever proves no more than what we never deny, that the Nature of the Elements are changed, as to their Virtue and Quality: but as to a change of their very substance, we do deny it upon reasons from Scripture and purer Antiquity; nor doth this

this Father attempt the Proof of any such a Change. He proves the contrary, when in your first Testimony from him he speaks p. 43. of the Elements Continuing What they were [that is as to

their Substance or Essence] and yet being changed into another thing, which must be as to quality and Use: and had you but translated this passage like a Scholar, and continued your quotation on a line or two further, you had found him proving this change of the Elements by, and comparing it with, that of a man by Baptism, whom no body believes to be changed thereby as to his substance, but onely to be renewed in-

wardly, and changed from a sinful state to a state of virtue and holiness by the influence of the Spirit of God; and therefore St. Ambrose could not affirm any more of the Elements than a change of quality by an accession of virtue, and power to sanctifie and to communicate to us Christs Body and Blood, and to apply to us all the Merits of his meritorious passion.

But after all this Father himself puts the thing out of debate betwixt us; when, in your last Testimony, he calls the consecrated Bread the Sacrament or Sym-

bol of his Flesh, and says that after consecration it is the sign of his Body; for so I translate *corpus significatur*, because afterwards speaking of the Wine, he says that after consecration it is called or bears the name of his Blood. Upon this place indeed you set up for a Critick, and give us a touch of your Greek and Hebrew, which I cannot read without smiling at it: all that I will say to you upon it is, that it is very hard for those that understand not Greek and Hebrew, that they must not be allowed to know p. 50, 51. what *significo* means; had that word been a branch from either of those tongues your Criticism would have looked somewhat like, whereas now it is but a more formal piece of trifling.

Quanto magis Operatorius est, ut sint quæ erant & in aliud commutentur. Ambros. de Sacram. l. 4. c. 4.

Ipse dixit & factum est: ipse mandavit & creatum est. Tu ipse eras, sed eras vetus creatura: postea quam consecratus es, nova creatura esse cepisti. Item, Ibidem. p. 439. Tom. 4. Edit. Froben.

Vere ergo carnis illius Sacramentum est — ante Benedictionem verborum celestium alia species nominatur, post consecrationem corpus significatur — post consecrationem lingulis nuncupatur. Ambros. de iis qui mysteriis iniciantur. c. 9.

Optatus his Testimony is nothing to the Purpose, and that from *Gaudentius* is so far from being for your *Transubstantiation*, that it is directly against you, as had I time or room here, I could easily shew.

p. 51. St. Hierom's places prove the very same, that is against you, as first that which says it was Bread our Saviour gave to his Disciples, and that that Bread was his Body, which sort of expressions your own learned men allow to prove a figurative Body only, since Bread can no otherwise be the Body of Christ.

que Discipulis suis, esse Corpus Domini Salvatoris, ipso dicente ad eos. accipite, comedite, Hoc est Corpus meum. St. Hieron. Hedibiz. Tom. 3. p. 144. Edit. Froben.

I wonder what you brought the Testimonies for, about the Clergy's always praying; if you did it for a touch at our married Clergy, remember that it touches your self; and tho' it does not me, yet this I will assure you that St. Hierom's Argument is very faulty and proves nothing at all because it proves too much, since if the Clergy must abstain from Matrimony, because they must always pray; upon the very same reason all the Christian Laity will be obliged also to abstain from it, they being most expressly commanded to pray without ceasing.

p. 53. From St. Chrysostom you have brought us a great many passages. How much that Learned Father delighted in Rhetorical Flights hath been already observed above, when I examined just such quotations as these about St. Peter's Supremacy; and that his Homilies are not to be strictly taken, nor can be in a literal sense, hath been abundantly proved above; However here you are for having the passages you cite him for about a Transubstantiation taken in a literal sense: which no man of learning would have said, since it is impossible they should: I will instance but in one of them, How many now say, I would see his Form, his Figure, his Garments and his Shoes, behold thou seest him, thou touchest him, thou eatest him. I appeal to that person of meanest judgment in your whole Church, whoever he be; to your own second thoughts, whether any one can or does, strictly speak.

Πόσοι νῦν λέγουσι, ἰβυλόμην αὐτὴν τὴν μορφήν ἰδεῖν, τὸν τύπον, τὰ ἱμάτια, τὰ ὑποδήματα; ἰδεῖν αὐτὸν ὅσως, αὐτὴν ἀσπῆσαι, αὐτὸν ἐδῆσαι. D. Chryl. in Matth. Tom. 2. p. 514. Edit. Savil.

them, How many now say, I would see his Form, his Figure, his Garments and his Shoes, behold thou seest him, thou touchest him, thou eatest him. I appeal to that person of meanest judgment in your whole Church, whoever he be; to your own second thoughts, whether any one can or does, strictly speak.

speaking, See, Touch or Eat our Saviour : therefore if you will have a literal sense of these and such his hyperbolical expressions, you are easily answered that these passages you quote from St. Chrysostom prove nothing at all, because they prove too much ; because they assert that which all learned men nay all men except you, grant to be impossible. But besides all this, you your self afford us a little passage, which evidently destroys your attempt of making St. Chrysostom a Transubstantiation man, which you endeavour by your English to obscure, (as you have served many a larger place in your Book) and therefore I will clear the place thus, for as that Body is united to Christ, so we also are united to him by this Bread, which sufficiently proves the Substance of the Bread to remain in the Eucharist. St. Chrysostom's opinion as to this point in controverſie betwixt us is so apparent from the late recovered Epistle of his to Casarius, as nothing can be more, I shall reserve it to a further particular occasion.

καθ' ὅσον
γὰρ τὸ σῶ-
μα ἐκείνο
ἦν ἑνὸς τοῦ
Χριστοῦ,
ὥστε καὶ
ἡμῶς ἐκεί-
νου διὰ τοῦ
ἄρτου ἐν-
ῶμα.
Idem. in
1 Ep. ad
Corinth.
Tom. 3. p.
379.

C H A P. XXIV.

His further Arguments for it out of St. Austin, Cyril of Alexandria, Theodoret, &c. Answered.

I Must in the next place follow you to St. Austin, and see what you would have from him, who is so extraordinary plain and so point blank against Transubstantiation. I will not only say, that the Places you have from him, as spoken allegorically cannot do your business, tho' you help them (as you did St. Hierom, when you translated *Vinum*, Blood ; St. Chrysostom when you translated ἀῖμα the Eucharist) by translating *Sacramentum* a Sacrifice : but will give you a place or two to convince you that St. Austin was not for Transubstantiation.

In his Book against Adamantius, he says plainly, For only Lord made no Scruple to say, this is my Body, when he gave the Sign of his Body.

Non enim Dominus dubitavit dicere, Hoc est Corpus meum, cum Signum daret Corporis sui. Aug. contr. Adamant. c. 12. Edit. Basil.

In

In his *Epistle to Boniface* he says, ⁽¹⁾ that if the Sacraments had no resemblance with those things whereof they are the Sacraments, they would not be Sacraments at all: from their resemblance it is that they commonly bear the names of the things themselves: for as the Sacrament of the Body of Christ is after a certain manner the Body of Christ, so the Sacrament of Faith is Faith. I might easily shew you, how he distinguishes between *Sacramentum* and *Res Sacramenti*, that *Judas* onely received *Panem Domini*, whereas the rest of the Apostles received *Panem Dominum*; but I must hasten to your next Testimonies from *St. Cyril of Alexandria*, the first of which hath been already more than once answered; your second is directly against your self, the Jews fault being that they understood our Saviour in a literal sense, and not in the Spiritual in which he meant it; and *Nicodemus* his fault was of the same nature about *Regeneration*, so that you certainly took this place on trust without considering it; and your Jeer at the end of it is both groundless and ridiculous; *hictus doctus*, *he* Presto, be gone, do far better become your People who teach that upon pronouncing *hoc est corpus meum* the Bread is gone, and the Body of Christ is in its room in a trice: but to pass such childish stuff, your last Testimony from this *St. Cyril* does not deserve any consideration, it proving nothing for your purpose.

Sanguinis Christi Sanguis Christi est, ita Sacramentum Fidei Fides est. Aug. Ep. 23. ad Boniface. P. 62, 63. P. 63.

† *Theodoret*. I am now arrived at † him, whom of all men I little thought you would have cited in, and of all places you would not have medled with that you do; but to give you your due, you are a hardy man, and resolved to go through with *Theodoret* also, tho' you loose some Skin by it, and get never so many blows and hard words. Well then you bring us his second Dialogue against the *Eutychians*, where after the Questions asked and answered about the Sacramental Bread and Wine, their being the symbols of the true Body and Blood of Christ, which is also received in self in the *Eucharist*: the * *Eutychian* thinking he had caught the *Orthodox Adversary*,
 * ὁ ὀπισθε τοίνυν τὰ σύμβολα τοῦ σώματος καὶ τοῦ αἵματος, ἀλλὰ μὴν οἱ περὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ὀρθόδοξοι ἀντιθέμενοι τὴν ὁρίαν. ——— Orthodox. ———

argues

argues upon *his* concession, that *as the Symbols then of the Body and Blood* [here you make a stop, and it was time for you to do it, wherein you shew, tho' no honesty, yet some cunning; but I must continue the objection of the *Eutychian* to make the sense clear and full, as well as to ruine your silly design hence] *are one thing before Consecration, but after it are changed, and made another thing; just so the Body of our Lord after its assumption is changed into the divine Substance or Nature.* This was the *Eutychians* Ar-

gument upon which the † *Orthodox* makes a quick reply, and tells him that he was caught in his own Nets, since the *Mystical Symbols* [the blessed Bread and Wine] do not after [or upon] their Consecration depart from their essential Nature, but continue in their former Sub-

† Ἐλεως αἱς ὑφ' ἡμῶν ἀκούσιν. ὁ Ν
ῶ μετὰ τὸ ἀμασμον τὰ μυστικά συμ-
βολα τὸ οὐκ αἱ ἐξίσταται οὐτως
μῆτις ὁ δὲ τὸ περὶ τῶν οὐσίας καὶ τῶ
χρήματι καὶ τῶ ὁσίου, καὶ ἐξελθὼν
καὶ ἀπὸ οὗ καὶ πρὸς τὴν ἡν. The-
odoret. Dial. 2. p. 85. Edit. Sir-
mond. 1642.

stance, Form, and Kind, and are as visible, and as palpable now, as they were before their Consecration, &c. This place * ἐτὶ τὰ of *Theodoret* is so demonstrative against Transubstantiation, οὐκ ὄντα that you had need, if you must be bringing it in for you, σύμβολα to obscure the sense by your abrupt & caetera, and to falsify τῇ τῇ σὺ-ματι καὶ it too as you have done here by a ridiculous Translation, ἀμασμον which quite spoils *Theodoret's* Argument hence against the *Eutychians*, as I shall by and by shew in one of my *Corol- εἰς τῇ- laries*; in the interim to let you and the world see the intol- μκεν, ὁ * erable dissingenuity of your Translating ὅσον με- τὰ τὰ βάλων, other than in their own nature, I will but bring a short pas- ἀλλὰ τὸ sage out of his first Dialogue to evince it, where he sayes, καὶ οὕτω τῇ * our Saviour honoured the Symbols and Signs [the Sacramental οὕτως περ- Bread and Wine] with the names of his Body and his Blood, ἰδεομεν. Idem. Di- not [by] changing at all their NATURE, but by adding of αἱ. τ. p. 18. GRACE to Nature.

Proclus of *Constantinople* your next Author is directly a- Διὰ τοῖς- gainst your self, since it is the Presence of the Holy Ghost αὐτῶν τοῖνυ- cording to him, and not of the Natural Body and Blood of οὐχ ὅντων τὸ Christ, which makes the Bread and mingled Wine, the very Body Επιστάτη- and Blood of Christ. ον τῷ ἁγίῳ

Πατρὶ μαλίσ-
τος προσέδωκεν, ὅπως τῇ ΑΥΤΟΥ Θείᾳ Παρούσᾳ τὸ προσκείμενον εἰς ἱερουργίαν ἄρτον καὶ οἶνον
ὁσέως μεμιγμένον, αὐτὸ ἐκείνο τὸ σῶμα καὶ αἷμα τὸ σῶν ἡμεῶν---ἀποφῶν τῆ καὶ ἀνα-
δείξῃ. Proclit. P. de Traditione D. Liturgia. p. 581. Edit. Romæ. 1530.

Your Quotation from *Eucherius* (p. 64.) falls in with those from *St. Ambrose*, and is answered *there*. That from *Isidore Pelusiota*, (p. 65.) and that from *Pope Leo*, which is false translated, have been answered sufficiently above. Your Story out of *Gregory Turonensis*, (p. 66.) were it true, makes nothing to your purpose; but you ought to remember that we always demand the genuine plain Testimonies of Fathers in the Controversie about Transubstantiation, and cannot admit, or rely upon Stories and Miracles, such as *this* is, and *that* from (p. 69.) *Paulus Diaconus*.

I am weary of this tedious Examination of further particular places of Writers at too great a distance to be set up, were they really what they are far from being, against the Primitive Fathers as to this Controversie. I will only vindicate your *Pope Gregory the Great*, and our Countryman *Venerable Bede*, and then leave off this Method of answering. The place you quote from *Gregory* does you no service, since it is so very allegorical and cannot be taken in a literal sense; but

p. 68. (d) *Ipsi qui sumimus Communio- nem hujus sancti panis & Calicis, unum Christi corpus effici- mur. — Quasi- mus — ut illius Salu- tavis capi- amus effe- ctum* *that which we meet with in his* (d) *Sacramentary is directly against Transubstantiation, where in Prayer it's said, We which do receive the Communion or Sacrament of the consecrated Bread and Cup, are made one Body of Christ.*

(e) *Venerable Bede's words are as clear as we could wish, and as full against Transubstantiation as we can speak, when he sayes, that our Saviour Christ substituted into the place of the Flesh and Blood of the Paschal Lamb, the Sacrament of his own Flesh and Blood under the figure of Bread and Wine,* (f) *and in another place, that our Lord gave to his Disciples at his Last Supper the Figure of his sacred Body and Blood.*

Greg. L. Sacram. p. 1337. Ed. Par. 1695.

(e) *ut videlicet pro carne Agni vel sanguinem sue carnis sanguinisq; Sacramentum in Panis ac Vini Figurâ substituens, &c. Beda Comm. in Luc. 22. p. 424. Edit. Colon. 1612.*

(f) *Cenâ, in quâ Figuram sancti corporis, sanguinisq; sui Discipulis tradidit, &c. Idem in Psal. 3. p. 324.*

CHAP. XXV.

Some Corollaries against Transubstantiation.

HAVING hitherto sufficiently answered all your pretended *Proofs* for *Transubstantiation*, and shewn in part the *Sense* and *Arguments* of the *Fathers* against it, instead of wearying my self, or rather our Reader with any more of your *Authors* which you very irregularly place, and which you your self will grant to be produced to no purpose, if the former *Primitive Fathers* were of a contrary Faith about the *Eucharist*: I shall here adjoyn a few *Corollaries* to vindicate the Faith of the *Catholick* and *Apostolical Church* of *England* against *Transubstantiation*, and will make it apparently clear that her *Doctrine* and *Faith* herein is both *Primitive* and *Orthodox*, and exactly the same with that of the *Fathers* of the *Catholick Church*.

My first *Corollary* shall be, That the *Fathers* gave such *Titles* to the *Consecrated Elements* of *Bread* and *Wine*, as utterly exclude a *Transubstantiation*.

It was sufficiently common with them, to call the *Elements* ^a the *Figure*, ^b the *Sign*, ^c the *Type*, ^d the *Antitype*, ^e the *Terminall-Similitude*, ^f and the *Symbols* of the *Body* and *Blood* of *Christ*, ^{an. con. Marcion.} and a whole *Oecumenical Council* of 338 *Bishops* at *Constantinople*, A. D. 754. declare them to be the true (and onely) ^{l. 4. c. 40. Bida. Comment. in 3. Psalm.} Image of our Saviour's *Body* and *Blood*.

^b August. de Doctr. Christi c. 7. ^{Origin. Dialog. cont. Marcion. p. 116. Edit. Wets.} ^c Basil. Anaphora. ^{Cyil. Hierosol. Col. 4. Cat. Mys.} ^d Greg. Naz. Orat. 112. ^{Macarius. Hom. 27.} ^e August. in Gratiano. ^f Theodoret. Dialog. 2. ^g Tom. 6. Concil. Edit. Colart.

These Expressions and the like I argue to be utterly inconsistent with the *Elements*, being *Transubstantiated* into the very *Body* and *Blood* of *Christ*, since it is impossible any thing can be the *Figure* of a thing, and the thing it self; or the thing it self, and yet but the figure of it: he that will affirm this may without an absurdity say that the *Sign* of the *King* at a *Tavern door* is the *King himself*, that the *Picture* of the *Ship*

in *St. Paul's Church-yard* is as real a true Ship, as any on the River, and that the Image of the King in the Exchange is really King James 2d. in his very Person. In short, if anything be the Figure, it cannot be the thing; if it be the thing it self, it cannot be the Figure of it, since nothing can be the Figure of it self. And therefore if *Christ's Natural Body* be really on the *Altar*, that which is there cannot be the Figure of it; But if (as the *Fathers* almost unanimously speak) that which is there be the Figure, the Sign of it, then consequently our *Saviour's Natural Body* it self is not.

See Tertul-
lian's 4th
Book a-
gainst Mar-
cion. ch.
40th.

This is so evident, I think I need not say any more upon this Point, I might very easily else have shewn that the Strength of one of *Tertullian's* Arguments, for our *Saviour* his having a true substantial Body, against *Marcion* depended wholly on the *Eucharist*, its being the FIGURE of his Body: but I

h Et potest Sacramentum Adoptionis, Adoptio nuncupari. Sicut Sacramentum Corporis & Sanguinis ejus, quod est in Pane & Poculo consecrato, Corpus ejus & Sanguinem dicimus. Non quod proprie Corpus ejus sit Panis & Poculum Sanguis: Sed quod in se Mysterium Corporis ejus, sanguinisq; contineant. Hinc & ipse Dominus benedixit Panem & Calicem, quem Discipulis tradidit, Corpus & Sanguinem suum Vocavit. Facund. Herm. pro Defens. 3. Caput. Con. Chalced. Lib. 9. c. 5. p. 404, 405. Edit. Simond. 1629.

will wave it, and conclude this *Collary* with that of *Facundus*, ^b Bishop of *Hermiana* in *Africa*, the *Sacrament* of *Adoption* may be called by the name of *Adoption*, as we call the *Sacrament* of the *Body* and *Blood* of *Christ*, the consecrated Elements of *Bread* and *Wine*, his *Body* and his *Blood*; not that the *Bread* is properly his *Body*, or the *Cup* his *Blood*, but because they contain the *Mystery* of his *Body* and *Blood*: upon which very account it is, that when our *Lord* delivered the consecrated *Bread* and *Cup* to his *Disciples*, he called

them his *Body* and his *Blood*. One thing I must not forget here, that tho' these *Fathers* and the *Church* of *England* with them, look upon the consecrated Elements as Signs and Figures onely, yet they and we believe that by the Institution of *Christ* they are the Means of conveying all the Virtue and Benefits of our *Saviour's* crucified *Body*, of communicating the *Blood* and *Body* of *Christ* unto every worthy Communicant. This I could not omit to let you see the filliness of your foolish Cant up and down of meer Signs of what, meer figures, &c. such Expressions were designed against the *Church* of *England*,

or

or what do they in your Book, against her; if they were, I must tell you that they are sottishly ridiculous, and most intolerable from a man, who was, I am sorry I can say it, a Minister of the Church of England, and therefore must so often have seen her Articles, and so often have used her Communion-Service.

My Second Corollary is, That such things are attributed to the Sacramental Body and Blood of Christ, by the Primitive Fathers, as do altogether exclude their being transubstantiated into the Natural Body and Blood of Christ.

I instance in that of the Sacramental Body and Blood of Christ their being said to Nourish our Bodies.

That the consecrated Elements do nourish our Bodies is very apparent from ^a St. Justin Martyr's saying that our flesh and blood are nourished by the consecrated Elements being changed into our Substance: From ^b Irenæus and ^c Tertullian, that our Flesh is fed and nourished with the Body and Blood of Christ: From ^d Origen, that the Eucharist as to its Material Part, undergoes the common course of our common repasts: From ^e Isidore of Sevil, that the Substance of the Visible Bread and Wine do nourish the outward man, that is our Bodies, as the Word of Christ, the Living Bread doth nourish the Souls of the Faithfull Communicants.

percipiunt verbum Dei, sit Eucharistia Sanguinis & Corporis Christi, ex quibus augetur & consistit Carnis nostræ Substantia. S. Iren. c. Har. l. 5. c. 12.

^c Caro Corpore & Sanguine Christi vescitur, ut & Anima de Deo saginetur. Tert. de Resurrect. c. 8.

^d Ille Cibus, qui sanctificatur per Verbum Dei, perq; obsecrationem, juxta id quod habet materiale, in ventrem abit & in secessum ejicitur. Orig. in 15 Matt. p. 27.

^e Quia sicut visibilis Panis & Vini substantia exteriorem nutrit & inebriat hominem: ita Verbum Dei, qui est Panis Vivus, participatione sui Fidelium recreat mentes. Isidor. Hispal. apud Rathramni. Lib. de Corp. & Sang. D. p. 120. Edit. Paris. Boileau. 1686.

Rathramne or Bertram ^f uses this Nourishment of our Bodies by the Sacramental Body and Blood, for an Argument to prove his distinguishing betwixt the Sacramental and the Natural Body of Christ to be just and necessary: *Our Saxo*

^g Illa Eucharistia temporaria est, non æterna: corruptibilis; eritq; minutim divisibilis: inter Dentes manditur, & in secessum emittitur. Homilia Anglo. Sax. apud nos Whelochi in Beda. L. 5. c. 22. p. 472. Edit. Cantabrig. 1644.

Paschal

Paschal Homily, which used to be read in our Churches in the Tenth Century follows *Rathramn* exactly in this point, and teaches that the *Sacramental Body* is corruptible, because it may be broke into several pieces, grinded by the Teeth, and being swallowed down into the Stomach, is thence cast into the draught.

Having collected *Passages* enough, that which I intend to prove from them is, that the *Natural Body* and *Blood of Christ* (into which you *Transubstantiators* say the *Bread* and *Wine* upon Consecration are *transubstantiated*) cannot without the greatest impiety be thus said to *Nourish our Bodies*. There is no one that understands what *Nourishment* means, how that macerating by the Teeth, Digestion in the Stomach, Separation in the Guts of the impure and excrementitious (which passes into the draught) from the purer, which passing through the *Lacteals*, and other chanel's falls into the *Common Mass* of *Blood*, are all necessary in order to *Nourishment* ; but must at the same time abhor the very thought of our Saviours *Natural Body* undergoing such tortures and changes in order to the *Nourishment* of our Bodies. Either it is *Bread* or *Wine*, or the *Natural Body* and *Blood of Christ* that undergoes these several stages in order to our *Nourishment* : Neither you nor we talk of any third Body for these purposes. If there be no *Bread* and *Wine* upon Consecration left, which you affirm, then it is unavoidable that the *Natural Body* and *Blood of Christ* which are come into the others place must afford this *Nourishment* to our Bodies ; but if you dare not affirm this, which it were most blasphemous to do ; it will of necessity follow that the substances of the *Bread* and *Wine* do after consecration continue in order to this *Nourishment*, and therefore no *Transubstantiation* either is or could be believed by them, who did attribute this power of nourishing to the *Sacramental Body* and *Blood of Christ*.

3. Coroll. My next Corollary is, That the Fathers speak such things of the *Eucharist*, as are perfectly inconsistent with its having after Consecration the bare Accidents, and Species of *Bread* and *Wine*.

The Proof of this Corollary depends upon the preceding, which shewed that the General Doctrine of the Fathers was that

that our *Bodies* are *nourished* by the *Sacramental Body* and *Blood of Christ*. Now as I made it evident in the last *Corollary* that *this Nourishment* was infinitely inconsistent with the *Nature of Christ* his *Natural Body* now, and for ever to continue, in a glorified state; so it is as easie to shew, that *such Nourishment* is as inconsistent with your^s upstart ridiculous Doctrine of *Accidents*: Since the *bare Accidents* and *Species* cannot *nourish* a *Body*, and since it is impossible that *That* which hath neither *Substance*, *Matter*, *Quantity* nor *Body* should give or add to another *both Substance*, *Matter*, *Quantity* and *Body*, every one of which are necessary to a *corporal Nourishment*: from which we must conclude that the *Fathers* never so much as dreamed of *bare Accidents* after Consecration, since *They* taught and wrote that which is utterly inconsistent with *such things*, and consequently with *Transubstantiation*.

This *Corollary* I intended chiefly for your sake Mr. *Sclater*, and the late *Translator*'s of *Bertram*, **Monsieur Boileau** Printed the *Dean of Sens*. As you had a mind to impose upon us at *Paris*. that *Irenaeus* his *pars terrena* of the *Eucharist* was the *Accidents*, which consequently must *nourish* us, notwithstanding *P. 37.* their having nothing of *Substance*; so † he very gravely up † *p. 89.* and down his *Translation*, and his *Remarks* tells us of the *Bodies* being *nourished* by that which falls under the *sense*, by *S. 19. P. 118. S. 40.* which he onely means as he continually explains himself, the *P. 152,* *meer figure* and *vail*, the *meer Accidents* of *Bread* and *Wine*, &c. *126. S. 49,* with which the *Natural Body* and *Blood of Christ* are *vailed*.

I must acknowledge that I am astonished to see a man, who hath doubtless a great deal of *Learning*, write direct *nonsense* with such *formal Gravity*: I durst appeal to his own Conscience, and am perswaded that he does not believe himself, that *Figures*, *Vails* and *Accidents*, which according to all mens notions of them are without any *substance*, and are perfect *nothings* as to *Body*, can give *nourishment* to, or increase the *Substances* of our *Bodies*. A man might as well write that people may dine at *Church* on the *Ministers* voice, as that *non-entities*, *meer nothings* can *nourish* our *Bodies*. But if you two be resolved to believe so still, I would desire no other Argument to make you both recant, than that you

two (were the thing possible in Nature to separate the *Accidents*, *Qualities*, and *Modifications* of *Bodies* from the *Substances* of the *Bodies themselves*) might be put up, and constrained to live but *one fortnight* upon these *same Accidents* and *Vails*, and try how nourishing they are: I am pretty certain that it would cure you of believing corporeal *Accidents*, and him of ever writing again that *Figures* do, or can nourish.

* *Quis* I will conclude this Corollary with a passage out * of *St. Austins Soliloquies*, which will abundantly confirm all that I have said in this Corollary, *Who can grant*, (faith he) or *think it possible, that that which is in* [and depends for its being upon] a Subject, *can continue, when the Subject it self* is perished? for it is a *Monstrous thing*, and as far as can be *est, mereat* from Truth, that that which would have no Being but for the *ipso inveni-* Subject in which it is, *can still have a Being, when its Subject* *Ho? Mon-* [on which it depended] *hath none.*
struosam
enim, & à veritate alienissimum est, ut id, quod non esset, nisi in ipso esset, etiam cum ip-
sam non fuerit, possit esse. D. August. Soliloq. l. 2. c. 13. p. 536. Edit. Basil. 1569.

Before I pass to my next Corollary, I must make a little Digression to expostulate with the French Dean about his Translation of *Ratbrann* or *Bertram*, and his Remarks upon it: He must certainly think so much wrong could not be put upon so venerable a Writer, and no body would speak in his behalf; it was a strange attempt to make *Bertram* a good Catholic, that is in your stile, a true man for Transubstantiation at last, when hitherto their Church had damned this Writer to the Pit of Hell, and Mr. *Sclater* himself hath very chronologically put him among the followers of *Berengarius*, who first disturbed the long peace, and as long continued Faith of the Catholic Church of Transubstantiation. This strange attempt was accompanied with Arts and Tricks, as strange, and unusual with all honest men, that is, with a violent perverting of the Authors sense, and an unjust, and most foolish Turn of the whole design of *Bertram*. † This Gentle man makes *Bertram* to write his Book against some that held

p. 76.
 p. 75.
 † In his
 Remarks
 upon *Ber-*
tram, p. 207, 208, &c. Printed at the end of his Translation. Paris, 1686.

our Saviour's Natural Body was received in the Eucharist without any Vail or Figure, that is, to put it into downright English, with the very same dimensions, Skin, Hair, Flesh, Head, Feet and Arms that he had on the Cross. But is it probable there ever were any such men? NO, it is so far from it, that it is impossible there ever could, since this Opinion must be grounded upon their seeing it so, which I am sure never was, never could be: this Gentleman thinks the very † knowing what † Prof. ftercoranism means is enough to confute it; but is it not far P. 21. stronger against this fancy of his, for I dare not call it any mens Opinion, since I am very well satisfied there never could be any men that held such a thing.

It is pleasant however to see, how the Dean goes about to prove, that there was such an Opinion, and such men, against against which our Author did write this Tract; he tells us, that one Abbaudus, and one Gaultier, Prior of St. Victor held that our Saviour's Natural Body was palpable and sensible in the Eucharist: but since these men by his own Confession lived two or three hundred years at soonest after Bertram, it is but a very odd way of proving that there were such men in or before Bertram's time, because there were about three hundred years after. Such proof is fitter for Children, than Deans of Cathedrals to use, and ought no more to pass from him, than p. 213, if it came from them: but to help himself and his ridiculous 214. Authorities, he tells us that it is not probable, that they two were the first Authors of this Opinion; now for brevity sake to set this aside, which is pitiful begging and not proving, were these two men after all, the Abbaudus and Gualtier of this Opinion, that our Saviour's Body is received in the Eucharist without any Vail, or Figure? This is so very false, that I wonder how any man, that hath common sense or any learning could have the face to assert it; * they say indeed that

the Natural Body of Christ is palpable and sensible in the Eucharist, but that they do not mean sensible to the Eye, or visible, * --Cogitaveram et illis aliqua respondere, qui dicunt

ipsum Corpus non frangi, sed in Albedine ejus & Rotunditate aliquid fastuari; sed recognoscens ineptum esse in Evangelio Christi, de Albedine & Rotunditate disputare, &c. Abbaudus p. 211. — & sensualiter, non solum Sacramento, sed etiam veritate manibus Sacerdotum tractari & frangi & fidelium dentibus atteri. Ecce Catholica Fides. Iste autem Scholasticus sic exponit, vere quidem ait, est; sed in Sacramento tantum. Gaultier p. 212. in the Remarks.

is hence apparent because they talk of the *Whiteness* and and the *Roundness*, which certainly are *that* which you call the *vails of our Saviour's Body*; and all the intent of *their Arguments* was to prove, that *tho' our Saviour's Body* was hid under the *Accidents of Whiteness, Roundness, &c.* yet that it is palpable, and subject to be broke, since *Whiteness and Roundness* which are *meer Accidents*, could not be broken, or parted asunder. So that now we find by this *Dean's* help at last, that *Fathramm's* or *Beriram's Book* was writ against *no body*, and about *nothing*, since it is impossible there ever were *such Persons*, or *such an Opinion* for any body to write against.

Certainly *this Gentleman* thought all the world asleep besides their own Party, or he could never have had the courage to have writ such stuff, and tho' I do not wonder at the *French King's* giving his *Royal Privilege* to *this Book*, and calling the *Translator*, *his dearly beloved*, because I suppose he does not desire to be thought to have read, or examined the *Book*, yet I am perfectly amazed to find the *Approbation of the Sorbonne* to this most ridiculous nonsensical Piece, and can give my self no other reason for it, than that *those People* are resolved to approve and license *anything* against us, tho' it be at the same time as much against *common sense and reason*. I hope some one will do, what I cannot have room, or leasure to do here, that is, take this *Dean Boileau's Translation*, and *Remarks* to task, the very foundation of which I have perfectly ruined in *that little* I have said here; But to return,

- 4 Coroll. My fourth Corollary is, *That the Illustrations and Comparisons, by which the Fathers used to prove a Change in the Elements, do prove their Opinions to have been opposite to Transubstantiation.*

I will here instance in the several Comparisons, (1) of the *Nysien Orat. Water in Baptism*, (2) of the *Person baptized*, (3) of the *Oyl in Bapt. Christi*, (4) of the *Ordained Person*, (5) and of the *Altar*. These the *Fathers* made use of to prove such a change in the *Elements of Bread and Wine*. Now there is no man of any learning or sense will say they taught any *Transubstantiation* of the *Water*, of the *Person baptized*, of the *Oyl*, of the *Stones*.

- (1) *Greg. Hier. Catech. Mystag. 3.* (4) *Greg. Nysien. supra.* (5) *Idem Ibidem.*

of the *Altar*, or of the *Person ordained*, and therefore neither any *Transubstantiation* of the *Elements* of *Bread* and *Wine*. They compare these several changes together; and make them to be parallel and equal: So that it is evident they meant an equal change in them, and no *Transubstantiation* of one of them, more than of the rest.

And farther, all the change they attribute to any of these things, the *Water*, the *Oyl*, the *Baptized person*, &c. is not at all as to their substance, by removing it away; but as to the *Virtue*, *Quality*, *Office*, and *Use* of them by the *Accession* or *Influence* of the *Spirit* of *God*, as I have particularly shewed above in *Gregory Nyssen*, *Cyril of Hierusalem* and *St. Ambrose*: so that I may hence conclude, that as the *Primitive Fathers* taught no substantial change of any of those things mentioned, in order to the *Effects* they are dedicated to, so they taught none of the *Bread* and *Wine* in order to their *Communicating* to us the *Benefit* and *Virtue* of our *Saviour's Passion*.

I will end this Corollary with that of *Theodoret*, (2) οὗτος (2) οὗτος
Saviour honoured the Symbols and Signs; the Consecrated Bread τὰ ἱεράματα
and Wine, with the Titles of his Body and his Blood, not [by] να σὺ μὲν
changing their NATURE at all, but [by] adding GRACE τοιαύτην
NATURE. καὶ τὴν τῆ
σώματος
καὶ αἵματος
πεποινη-

εἰς τὸ σῶμα, ὃ καὶ φύσιν μεταβαλὼν, ἀλλὰ καὶ χάριν τῇ φύσει προσεθηκεῖς. *Theodoret.*
Dial. 1. p. 18. Edit. Sirmond 1642.

My fifth Corollary shall be, That the Argument from the *Eucharist* used by the *Fathers* to prove the *Verity* of the two *Natures* in *Christ*, doth evidently deny, and reject any *Transubstantiation*.

This I shall demonstrate from particular Fathers, most eminent in their times; the first of which shall be the *Great St. Chrysostom*, in his *Epistle* to *Casarius* a *Monk*, whom he was endeavouring to secure from *Apollinarius* his *Herese*, who denied the *Truth* of the two *Natures* in *Christ*. For the disproving of which, false Doctrine among other Arguments, He urges this from the *Eucharist*. (1) For as [in the *Eucharist*] before the *Bread* is Consecrated, we call it *Bread*, but after that by the mediation of the *Priest*, the Di-

(1) Sicut enim antequam sanctificetur Panis, Panem nominamus, divinam autem illum sanctificantem Gratiā, mediante Sacerdote, liberatus est quidem vine

Appellatione PANIS, dignus autem habitus est Dominici Corporis APPELLATIONE, etiam NATURA PANIS in ipso permansit, & non duo Corpora, sed unum Corpus Filii predicatur: Sic & hic Divinus Theodorus, id est, inundante Corporis natura, unum filium, unam Personam, utique fecerunt. Agnoscendum tamen inconsusam, & indivisibilem rationem, non in una solum Natura, sed in duobus perfectis. D. Chrys. Ep. ad Cas. in the Appendix to the Delept of the Exposition, &c. p. 156.

vine Grace hath sanctified it, it is no longer called Bread, but is honoured with the name of our Lord's Body, tho' the nature of Bread continue in it still; and it doth not become two distinct Bodies, but one Body of the Son of God; even so here the Divine Nature being united to the humans [or Body], they together make up but one Son, one Person. But must however be acknowledged to remain without Confusion after an indivisible manner, not in one NATURE, but in TWO PERFECT NATURES.

The very same Argument doth Theodoret urge against the Eutychians, whose Heresie was the same with that of Apollonarius, as I have above put down his words at large from his second Dialogue against the Eutychian Heresie (p. 70.)

One of your own Popes, Gelasius I. against the same Hereticks, sayes, (2) Doubtless the SACRAMENTS of the Body and Blood of Christ, which we receive, are a Divine Thing, *ita, quæ sunt in that they make us Partakers of the Divine Nature, though* the SUBSTANCE or NATURE of the BREAD and WINE *poris & sanguinis Christi, doth still remain: and indeed the Image and Likeness of* Christ's Body and Blood is celebrated in the Mysterious Action. By this therefore we are plainly taught to think the same of our Lord Christ himself, as we profess, celebrate and receive, in, or by, his IMAGE, that as the Elements pass into a Divine Nature, by the Operation of the Holy Ghost, and yet continue to have their own Proper Nature, so that principal Mystery (the Incarnation) the Virtue and efficacy of which the [Consecrated Elements] do truly Represent unto us, doth as evidently demonstrate, that there is One True and entire Christ, consisting of two distinct Natures.

vel NATURA PANIS & VINI: & certe IMAGO & SIMILITUDO CORPORIS & SANGUINIS Christi in Actione Mysteriorum celebrantur. Satis ergo nobis evidenter ostenditur, hoc nobis in ipso Christo Domino sentiendum, quod in ipsa Imagine proficimus, celebramus & sumimus. ut sicut in hanc, scilicet in Divinam transeunt, Sancto Spiritu perficiente Substantiam, PERMANENTEM tamen in sue (reli.) sua PROPRIETATE NATURA: Sic illud ipsum, Mysterium Principale, cuius nobis efficientiam, virtutemque veraciter REPRESENTANT, ex quibus consuetudine proprie PERMANENTIBUS unum Christum, quia integrum, verumque; Permanente demonstrant. Gelasius Papa de duobus in Christo Naturis in Biblioth. P. Præm. Parte 3. Tom. 5. p. 671. Edit. Colon. 1618. Ephrem

Ephrem, or Ephraïm, the Patriarch of Antioch in the sixth Century urges the same Argument (3) against the same Hereticks. (3) Apud Photii Biblioth. num. 229.

That which I gather from these evident places of these great Men is, that as they held the humane Nature to continue entire after its Union with the Divine into the One Person of Christ, so they held the true Substance of the Bread to continue after its Consecration into the Sacramental Body of Christ; and that if they had not believed this, they would never have used it as an Argument to prove the other.

These Places and this Argument are so convictive, that I admire that any man can believe Transubstantiation, that does but read and consider them. I know some of your Writers say, that the Fathers by Substance and Nature here mean onely the outward Appearance and the bare Accidents.

But, not to insist how we shall ever know any Author's sense in any one thing, if men may take this Liberty not onely to make a word signifie what they please, but the direct contrary to what it should and alwayes doth; This is to make the whole Argument of these several Greatest Men, of a Pope himself, and him perhaps as learned as ever sat in the Chair, and as Infallible, perfect Foolery and direct Sophistry; to give up their Cause, as well as their Arguments unto the Hereticks, their Enemies, while they make these Learned Fathers to prove that Christ had not the Appearance onely (which none of the Eutychians did deny him) but a true humane Nature by the Example of a Thing, which had not the true Nature of Bread, but the bare Appearance of it without any Substance.

Certainly such men do not consider what great wrong they doe to these Fathers in making their Arguments so very weak, and impertinent: Had They then believed Transubstantiation, it had been perfect Madness in Them to use the Eucharist for an Argument against the Hereticks, since the Hereticks would most easily have retorted it, and shewn out of their own mouths, that as upon Consecration the Substance of the Bread is gone, and nothing but the appearance of Bread remains; so upon the Union of the two Natures the humane was absorpt, or (to borrow a word of you for the Eutychians) transubstantiated into the Divine, and onely the Appearance of flesh remained:

maintained : and this the *Fathers* could never have disproved, if they themselves had held, that the *Appearance* of a *Thing* as to *Colour, Dimension, Smell, Taste, &c.* might *subsist* without the *Substance* unto which those *Accidents* do belong.

In a word, had there been such a thing as *Transubstantiation* believed then, as the *Fathers* could not have urged the *Example* of the *Eucharist* its continuing in the very same *NATURE* and *SUBSTANCE* it had before *Consecration* against the *Eutychian Hereticks* ; so it is *Morally Impossible* that those *Hereticks* should omit so home an *Argument* in *Defence* of themselves : but since these are never known to have urged any such thing for themselves, and we find the *Greatest* and most *Learned Fathers* urging the *Example* of the *EUCCHARIST* its remaining in the *TRUE SUBSTANCES* of *BREAD* and *WINE* after *CONSECRATION*, we have all the *Reason* in the *World* to conclude that the *Fathers* neither did, nor could ever believe such a thing as *Transubstantiation*.

I might have added another *Corollary* from the *Distinction* between the *Natural* and the *Spiritual Flesh* and *Blood* of *Christ* so much insisted on by the *Fathers*, *Clemens of Alexan-*

(4) *Pedag.*
L. 2. c. 2.

(5) *Illa*
Eucharistia
non est *Cor-*

CORPO-
RALITER
sed *SPIR-*
TUALI-

TER non

Corpus il-
lud QUO
passus est,
sed *Corpus*
illud de quo
locutus est :

quando *Panem & Vinum* in *EUCCHARISTIAM* nocte una ante *Passionem* suam *Consecravit*. *Al-*
fric. apud *Wheloci* notas in *Bed. H. E. l. 4. c. 24.* (6) *Hosia illa est Christi Corpus non*
Corporaliter, sed Spiritualiter. Non Corpus in quo passus est, sed Corpus de quo locutus est,
quando *Panem & Vinum* ea qua *Passionem* antecessit nocte in *Hosiam* *Consecravit*, & de *Sa-*
crato Pane dixit, *Hoc est Corpus Meum*, &c. *Wulphi* Oratio *Synodica* apud *Usser. de Christi.*
Ecol. Succes. & Statu, c. 2. p. 44. (7) *Hesychius* in *Levit. l. 2. c. 8.*

dria, (4) and others, and especially by *Rathmannor Bertram*, who hath made it the Subject of the *Second Part* of his *Book* from *Section 50th. p. 127* ; by our Countreymen (5) *Alfrick* *Arch-Bishop of Canterbury* in an *Epistle* to *Wulphin Bishop of jus Christi Shireburn*, and by *Wulphin* himself (6) in a *Synodical Oration* of his to his *Clergy*, in the *Tenth Century* near a *Thousand years* after *Christ*.

I might also have insisted on some more such, particularly on that Account in *Hesychius* (7) of the *Custom* of the *Church* of *Jerusalem* to burn what was left of the *Consecrated Elements* ; but to avoid being tedious, those I have already made are abundantly sufficient to shew, that *Transubstantiation* was not, could not be the *Belief* of the *FATHERS* ; that their

FAITH concerning the EUCHARIST is the very SAME with the FAITH taught and embraced by the CHURCH of ENGLAND, *which was the Thing I undertook to evince.*

C H A P. XXIV.

Two or Three Reflexions upon the Remainder of Mr. Sclater's Book: The Conclusion.

HAVING done This, I shall not trouble my self with the rest of your Citations, but shall wave them as not one jot to the Purpose, since if they should be against OUR CHURCH, I have already proved that they are much against THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH, I will onely make two or three Reflexions upon the Rest of your Book, and then take leave of you.

The First shall be upon your Great Lateran Council, That it did determine (allowing, what is denyed by some of your own side, that things were managed fairly at this Meeting) for Transubstantiation, and for the PAPAL POWER of DEPOSING KINGS at the same time. If it erred in Determining the LATTEr, why not in Determining the FIRST. I am sure that TRANSUBSTANTIATION is as MUCH against the PRIMITIVE FATHERS, as that DAMNABLE HERETICAL DOCTRINE of POPES POWER of DEPOSING of KINGS, and DISPOSING of their KINGDOMS can be. And we do not envy your having TRANSUBSTANTIATION determined by such a Council, as FIRST Conciliarly determined that HELLISH DOCTRINE of DEPOSING of KINGS, a Practice so Impious that Dr. BARNES not LONG SINCE in a SERMON before the FAMOUS UNIVERSITY of CAMBRIDGE thought it to be ONE of the most IRREFRAGABLE ARGUMENTS (to use his own words) to prove HIM [CHRIST his PRETENDER VICAR the POPE] to be THE ANTICHRIST, and he goes on to tell THEM, That whereas some have taken a great deal of Pains to prove HIM [the POPE] so, from the obscure Prophecies of Daniel; And

p. 84.
A Discourse concerning Christ's Kingdom, in TWO SERMONS preached before the University of Cambridge, Printed for Green, 1682. others p. 18, 19.

others with great Labour and Difficulties have applied all the Phenomena, and Characters of the Apocalyptical false Prophet to the POPE; THIS is a most SURE and COMPENDIOUS WAY of stamping upon HIM the MARK of the BEAST. This Doctor's words and Opinion I have chosen the rather for this Purpose, because I believe he doth not pass in the Rank of MISREPRESENTERS among YOU, and because it was in a SERMON before an UNIVERSITY, wherein HE told them, he would deal sincerely with THEM. I am perswaded that those of your Party that know HIM will grant him to be none of our fiery Zealots, and Furioso's against Popery, tho' HE doth in the second SERMON speak of JUST EXCLAMATIONS against the SUPERSTITIONS and IDOLATRIES of the CHURCH of ROME, and of a COMMENDABLE INDIGNATION against the WICKED and HELLISH PRACTICES of the ROMISH EMISSARIES to ESTABLISH the POPISH RELIGION.

p. 18. My next Reflexion is, that your Account of Berengarius discovers abundance of malice and of ignorance too, because He could not be the first Disturber of the long Peace of the Church, by teaching a Doctrine opposite to Transubstantiation, since in the Century before that Berengarius lived in, not to go abroad, in our OWN NATION the SAME DOCTRINE, that Berengarius did stand up for, was the COMMON FAITH

(1) p. 73. of OUR CHURCH, and was publicly taught, and believed, 81. as appears most evidently to a Demonstration from the

N. B. Publick Authorized SAXON HOMILY for EASTER, and from the Writings, and SYNODICAL ORATIONS (where-
(m) Eodem tempore Be- in a Man may most reasonably expect to meet with the ge-
rengarius in nuine and publick Faith of the Church) of ALFRICK ARCH-
hereticus BISHOP of CANTERBURY [our ENGLISH PATRI-
prolapsus ARCH] and of WULPHINE Bishop of SHIRBOURN, as
pravitatem, I have already observed, (1) and put down their words; and
omnes Gal- the SAME FAITH was generally believed by almost ALL the
los, Italos et FRENCH and ITALIANS as well as by the ENGLISH in
Anglos suis Berengarius his time, as Matthew Westminster tells us: (n) who
jam penecor- was mistaken in saying it was by the Infection of Berengarius's
ruperat pra- Doctrine, since it is certain THAT was the GENERAL and
vitatibus. PUBLICK DOCTRINE here in the Century before; and in
Matth. West. FRANCE
ad annum, 1087.

FRANCE the *Century* before *that* (to wit, in the NINTH CENTURY) as one may believe from the Writings of *Bertram* and *Erigena*.

And here I cannot but observe how much you discover p. 76.
a gross ignorance, when you make *Bertram*, and *Scotus Erigena* (whom you have split into two) Followers of *Berengarius*, whenas *They* both lived two Hundred years before *Him*. Nay a man would believe almost from you, that *Bertram* was at this present alive, when you say that *Berengarius's* Opinion and Arguments are still urged by *Bertram*, lately reprinted in English. You have a great deal more of such wretched stuff, but I am so weary of it, that I will but speak a word or two to you as to the *Greeks*, and then pass to a farewell request to you, and your new Superiours. p. 76.

That the present great Ignorance, Poverty and Ambition of the Greek Church hath taught a great many of them, leaving their own ancient Faith, to embrace for lucre sake the Latin Doctrine of Transubstantiation, is what we cannot now deny, but that which we have to say upon this business is, that those persons neither learned this new fangled Doctrine from the Fathers, from their own Liturgies, or from the ancient Creeds, or Ecclesiastical Constitutions; that *Gabriel* of See Dr. Philadelphia (who studied and lived so long at Padua and Venice) first broached Transubstantiation in their language, *Smith of Oxford his Miscellanea* since whom many Latinized Greeks have espoused it, and the four Patriarchs, at the Instance of *Monsieur Noimel*, or rather his French Monny (as I hope a Gentleman who was then in Turkey will ere long make it sufficiently appear) subscribed Ricaut his Preface to his Present State of the Greek Church. the Oriental Confession (drawn up by one bred in Italy) in the year 1672. not, as you falsely tell us, 1643.

As their Ignorance (which is so great, that *Sr. P. Ricaut* says most Mechanicks among us are more learned and knowing than the Doctors and Clergy of Greece) disposes them for any Doctrine whatever, so their great Poverty (which no body denies) and their unaccountable and prodigious Ambition hurry them on to any thing for lucre sake. The Dire effects of their extravagant Ambition are sufficiently seen in that they have thereby run their poor Church into such arrears with the Port, that it will never

Ricaut's be able to claw off. Through their changing of Patri-
 archs (whereof they had six in eight years at Constanti-
 State of the Greek People) and their most unchristian shouldering of one another
 Church, out, the Poor Church was indebted in the year 1672. to the
 p. 102, Grand Seigneur three hundred and fifty thousand Dollars, as
 102, &c. Sr. Paul says he was informed by the Bishop of Smyrna.
 p. 98.

See Dr.
 Smiths
 Preface to
 Miscellanea

This is enough to shew the miserable Humour as well as
 Condition of those People, who to get monys to buy out
 the incumbent Patriarch and to place themselves tho' but for
 a month on the Patriarchal Throne at Constantinople, would
 I question not subscribe a worse Doctrine than that of Tran-
 substantiation, since they have ignorance enough for any.
 The behaviour of the Arch-Bishop of Samos to Doctor Smith
 of Maudlins, makes me to have a very slender opinion of
 those sort of men: when he met with him in France, then
 Children only received in the one kind, and they could not di-
 gest Flesh; but as soon as he had crossed the Water, and
 breathed a little English Air, then Children did undoubtedly
 partake in both kinds, as he quickly wrote to Doctor
 Smith. But enough of this Man, and the Humour of that
 miserable People, which is nothing to the purpose of a Con-
 sensus Veterum.

The Request I have now to make to you Mr. Schaefer is,
 that you would consider what a miserable mistake you have
 made about these things, how grievously you have suffered
 your self to be imposed upon, in leaving a Communion which
 is truly Catholick and Apostolical, and hath not one unlawful
 Term of Communion, and in falling to a Church which for all
 the Paints and Washes laid on it appears to be very deformed,
 and hath a great many unlawful Terms of Communion. If
 their Condition be dangerous that were bred in that Communi-
 on, if they have any opportunities (as all here in England
 have) of knowing more and of better information; what
 must be thought of yours, who can pretend no want of Infor-
 mation, have had so long a Tract of opportunities to have
 secured you even in old age from such a detestful Fall; I do
 from my soul wish that you may (before death surprizes)
 recover your self, and return to that true Faith from which
 you have swerved, and that all that lye under the same
 guilt:

guilt may in God's good time be again gathered into our Apostolical Church. May God remove all *Obstacles*, that do at present hinder such a *Return*.

And my request to your *Superiours* is, that if ever they think fit to have another *Convert* appear in Print against *us*, they would oblige us so far as to chuse one that hath a little more Modesty, and a little more Learning, one that can distinguish between the *Presbyters* of *Achaia* and St. *Andrew*, between the *Second General Council* of *Constantinople*, p. 72. and the (reputed) *Seventh* at *Nice*, whence he quotes that impudent lye of *Epiphanius* the *Deacon*; one that can translate what he is taught to borrow; that so if ever any of our Church vouchsafe to answer him, he may not have so many complaints to make as I have had in the *Examination* of Mr. *Sclater's* Book.

March 1st.

1686.

T H E E N D.
